DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 695 CE 036 053

AUTHOR	Rist, Ray C.; And Others
TITLE	Targeting on In-School Youth: Four Strategies for Coordinating Education and Employment Training. An Analysis of Four In-School Alternatives for Education and Employment Training. Interim Report #3.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Human Ecology at Cornell Univ.; Youthwork, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 80
NOTE	267p.; For related documents, see ED 224 901-903 and CE 036 049-052.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Awareness; Career Education; Coordination; Credits; Demonstration Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Cooperation; Educational Research; *Education Work Relationship; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; Institutional Cooperation; Job Development; Job Training; Low Income; Minority Groups; *Models; Postsecondary Education; Program Administration; School Business Relationship; Secondary Education; Student Participation; Unemployment; *Vocational Education; Work Experience Programs; Youth Employment; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; *Exemplary In School Demonstration Projects; Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act; Youth Employment Training Program; Youthwork Incorporated; Youthwork National Policy Study

ABSTRACT

The four programmatic school-to-work transition models being developed and implemented by Youthwork, Inc. are assessed. The thrust is both to distinguish these strategies, one from another, and to clarify the variations that occur within each of these four models: academic credit for work experience, expanded private sector involvement, career awareness, and job creation through youth-operated projects. An introductory chapter and another discussing methodology are followed by four substantive chapters, one for each of the four strategies being analyzed. Each chapter analyzes one strategy according to program administration, program curriculum, the form and content of granting academic credit, youth involvement in program operation, and staff-student relations. In addition, each model is studied from the perspective of one or more additional issues specific to the model. Recommendations for the generic as well as strategy-specific concerns are located at the end of each chapter. An analysis packet on program administration is appended. A summary and overview of those findings generic to all four strategies appear at the front of the report. (YLB)

ED230695

TARGETING ON IN-SCHOOL YOUTH:

FOUR STRATEGIES FOR COORDINATING EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT TRAINING

An analysis of four in-school alternatives for education and employment training.

Interim Report #3

Ray C. Rist
Principal Investigator

Mary Agnes Hamilton
Wilfred B. Holloway
Steven D. Johnson
Heather E. Wiltberger

YOUTHWORK NATIONAL POLICY STUDY
Cornell University
April 1980

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Rist

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 036 053

youthwork national policy study
n124 mvr hall
cornell university
ithaca new york 14853

(607)256 4431

OVERVIEW

to

TARGETING ON IN-SCHOOL YOUTH: FOUR STRATEGIES FOR COORDINATING EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

This report is the third in a series of Interim Reports to be prepared by the Youthwork National Policy Study on various aspects of the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects. These projects are being conducted under the auspices of Title IV, Part A, of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Acts (YEDPA) of 1977. The projects are a set of local programs and represent an effort by the U.S. Department of Labor in collaboration with countless local and state educational authorities, public and private sector organizations, and community based organizations to explore together improved means of providing employment and training opportunities for young people, particularly those from low-income and minority families. The Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects are administered through Youthwork, Inc., an intermediary non-profit corporation.

TARGEING ON IN-SCHOOL YOUTH is a report devoted to the analysis and explication of four strategies currently being employed to assist in-school youth in their career awareness and in making the transition from school to work. The four strategies--academic credit for work experience, increased private sector involvement, career awareness, and job creation through youth operated projects--all seek means of linking education and employment training. In this present report, selected aspects of these four strategies are examined in detail. These include the administration of the various projects, the curricula, the form and content of academic credit being granted, and the involvement of the youth themselves in the operation of the programs. Data for this report came from thirty-six projects in 29 states.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained by writing in care of the above address.

February 1980

a collaborative project of Youthwork, Inc. and New York State College of Human Ecology, a statutory college of the state university

There are two contrasting views of what is wrong in the job market. The first holds that many applicants are not hired because they lack basic competences required for effective performance or because they have acquired training for which there is little or no demand. If blame is to be apportioned, the educational system must be considered the major culprit. The opposing view holds that the educational system is a minor actor. The critical issue is the lack of strong and consistent demand for labor. A slack market means trouble no matter how well people have been educated and trained. I suggest that both positions are overstated: Both employers and employees, especially those with education and skill, possess considerable flexibility that should facilitate the absorption of new job seekers into the economy.

Eli Ginzberg, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.. i

ON-SITE OBSERVERS FOR THE YOUTHWORK NATIONAL POLICY STUDY......... viii

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS................................. x

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS................................ xi

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION................................. 1

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY: THE APPLICATION OF ETHNOGRAPHICH TECHNIQUES......................... 18

Theoretical and Empirical Rationale................ 21

The General Research Plan.......................... 24

Strengths and Limitations of the Data.............. 35

Targeting on In-School Youth: Four Strategies for Coordination Education and Employment Services... 36

CHAPTER THREE: ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR WORK EXPERIENCE............... 38

Program Characteristics............................ 39

The Determination of Academic Credit: Organization. 46

The Determination of Academic Credit: Competencies. 52

Program Administration............................. 56

Program Retention.................................. 72

Re-enrollment of Terminations...................... 79

Youth Involvement.................................. 81

Motivation... 85

Summary and Recommendations........................ 89

CHAPTER FOUR: EXPANDED PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT.............. 96
Program Characteristics.......................... 97
Analysis Format.................................. 102
Youth Involvement in Program Operation............ 109
Program Contact with Other Programs............... 111
Staff/Student Interaction......................... 115
Program Administration............................ 118
Summary and Recommendations....................... 126
CHAPTER FIVE: CAREER AWARENESS................................ 133
Program Characteristics........................... 134
Characterization of Program Administration......... 140
Structures for Youth Involvement in Program Operation.. 160
Academic Credit for Work Experience............... 168
Staff/Student Relationships....................... 170
Summary and Recommendations....................... 178
CHAPTER SIX: JOB CREATION THROUGH YOUTH-OPERATED PROJECTS....... 186
Program Characteristics........................... 187
Internal Differences Among Youth Operated Projects. 189
Program Administration............................ 201
Structures for Youth Involvement.................. 205
Academic Credit................................... 210
Program Curriculum................................ 210
Summary and Recommendations....................... 217
REFERENCES.. 222
APPENDIX A.. 229

PREFACE

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) became law on August 5, 1977. It amended the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) so as to provide the initiative for an expanded effort to address the problems of youth unemployment. YEDPA added several new programs to improve employment and training opportunities for young people in their late teens and early twenties, particularly those from low-income families. It has sought to emphasize more experimentation and innovation on the part of the CETA local government sponsor system than has been the case with programs developed for unemployed adults.

The Act is particularly concerned with overcoming the barriers between school and work by more closely linking education, employment, and training institutions. It seeks to forge new relationships. One of the four programs authorized by YEDPA was that of the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP). This program was designed to provide a full range of work experiences and skills necessary for future employment, especially for those low-income youth, 16 to 21 years of age, who are in school or out of school and unemployed or underemployed. Certain YETP provisions provisions also allow designated forms of participation by youth 14 and 15 years old, as well as by youth who are not economically disadvantaged.

What provides a sense of urgency to this effort is that there is a desperate need both to improve the education of low-income minority youth and to find the means by which to create more employment for them. The evidence on this point is both conclusive and sobering: the situation for poor minority youth, as compared with white middle-class youth, has steadily deteriorated over the past 15 years. Whether one measures employment rates or labor force participation rates, the disparities have grown and continue to do so. This is in spite of all the education, employment, and training programs initiated since the mid-1960s and carried on to the present (cf. Adams and Mangum, 1978:19-34).

The spending level for YEDPA for both fiscal years 1979 and 1980 has been approximately $1.1 billion. The first priority for these funds has been to generate in the vicinity of 300,000 employment opportunities for youth. As such, they have become an integral component of efforts by the administration to reduce the present levels of unemployment. Nevertheless, and in recognition that present approaches to reduce youth unemployment are imperfect, both in design and implementation, the Act has authorized the Secretary of Labor to allocate up to one-fifth of YEDPA funds on demonstration projects to support knowledge development. The mandate from the Congress was clear:

> Sec. 321. It is the purpose of this part to establish a variety of employment, training, and demonstration programs to explore methods of dealing with the structural unemployment problems of the nation's youth. The basic purpose of the demonstration programs shall be to test the relative efficacy of the different ways of dealing with these problems in different local contexts.

> Sec. 348. ...to carry out innovative and experimental programs, to test new approaches for dealing with the unemployment problems of youth, and to enable eligible participants to prepare for, enhance their prospects for, or secure employment in occupations through which they may reasonably be expected to advance to producting working lives. Such programs shall include, where appropriate, cooperative arrangements with educational agencies to provide special programs and services...

The monies that were to be distributed according to formula among the local sponsors of programs for youth would alleviate some unemployment and "buy time". Yet there was little confidence that, in the end, these projects would either address the long-term needs of the youth or provide new insights into how programs might be more effectively organized and implemented so as to have a greater impact. New ideas, new approaches, and new actors would have to be on the scene if innovative and path-breaking approaches were to be found. And while it was not explicit in the legislation, it can be surmised that it was the hope of the authors that if successful projects could be located where jobs were created and the youth were prepared to assume them, then perhaps cities and states would be encouraged to redirect portions of the 80 percent formula funds towards projects of this kind. Thus, the discretionary funds projects could achieve a ripple effect throughout the entire infrastructure of youth employment and training programs.

To learn more about one aspect of the complex set of relations between education and present/future employment opportunities, the Department of Labor set aside in Fiscal Year 1979 from the discretionary funds approximately $15 million for "Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects". These grants were to explore the dynamics of in-school projects and their effectiveness. They also would be awarded to promote cooperation between the education and employment and training systems.

To assist the Department of Labor and its regional offices in undertaking this effort, Youthwork, Inc., an intermediary non-profit corporation, was established in January 1978. It was created with financial and administrative support from the Field Foundation, the Public Welfare Foundation, the Southern Education Foundation, the Taconic Foundation, and the Eleanor Rooosevelt Institute. Youthwork's responsibilities were to include: developing guidelines for the competition to select the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects, reviewing submitted proposals, making recommendations for funding, providing guidance and technical assistance for those projects selected in the competition, developing and implementing a knowledge development plan so as to increase understanding of different approaches and their effectiveness, and forwarding research reports and policy recommendations to the Department of Labor.

As a result of a five-tier evaluation process designed to select from among the more than 520 submitted proposals, Youthwork made its recommendations to the Department of Labor. Forty-eight projects were chosen. The first contracts were signed and projects began operation in September 1978. Forty-seven of the original 48 projects have been or are now (February 1980) operational.[1]

---

[1] An additional nine projects were also funded during Fiscal Year 1979 on a non-competitive basis.

To assess these projects and their efficacy in achieving the twin goals of program effectiveness and inter-institutional collaboration, Youthwork undertook a number of knowledge development efforts. These were to include the use of analytic ethnographic material collected by a trained observer placed at each project, third-party evaluations, MIS systems, and self-study reports from the individual projects.

For the first of these efforts, that of developing a cross-site comparative framework employing qualitative data collection strategies, Youthwork, Inc., selected in September 1978 a group of researchers at the College of Human Ecology, Cornell University. The Cornell project, entitled "Youthwork National Policy Study", has undertaken a longitudinal qualitative research program. Trained observers at each of the project sites have been gathering data on selected key policy issues. These data are, in turn, analyzed and used by the Cornell staff as the basis for reports (such as the present) and for the development of national policy recommendations.

TARGETING ON IN-SCHOOL YOUTH: FOUR STRATEGIES FOR COORDINATING EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES is the third of the Interim Reports to be prepared by the Youthwork National Policy Study. The Report provides a systematic and detailed assessment of the four strategies being employed by Youthwork, Inc. to effect a closer linkage between education and employment for in-school youth. The goal is to provide a framework within which to view these four strategies and assess their relative utility for different target populations of youth. Each of the four strategies will be analyzed according to: program administration, program curriculum, the form and content of granting academic credit, youth involvement in program operation, and staff-student relations. The thrust is to both distinguish these strategies, one from another, and to also clarify the variations that occur within each of the approaches. The analysis is both inter- and intra-organizational.

Data for this present report have been gathered by trained on-site observers at thirty-six projects in 29 states. The data have taken the forms of intensive and in-depth interviews, non-participant observations, the use of written materials, and statistics gathered by each site for the purpose of reporting to the Department of Labor and to Youthwork, Inc. A more detailed discussion of the methodology is to be found in Chapter Two.

The Report is divided into seven sections: the Introduction, a chapter discussing the methodology, four substantive chapters, one for each of the four strategies being analyzed and the Summary and Recommendations. Each of the four substantive chapters will examine one strategy in light of the six analytic areas listed earlier.

Appreciation must be expressed to the many on-site observers associated with our effort. They have consistently performed with a level of interest and competence during their many months in the field. A list of their names follows this Preface. Likewise, mention must be given to the local project personnel who have been generous with their time and candid in their responses. As a means to protect those persons at the local sites who have been part of this sizeable knowledge development effort, anonymity was promised from the beginning. Those who have participated will know who they are. Perhaps they will recognize themselves amidst the descriptive and interview data.

In those instances where a local site does not believe itself to have been represented accurately, even if anonymously, we would welcome comment and feedback. We would note that attempting to do justice simultaneously to data from 40 or more sites has been a challenge. The trade-off between scope and depth is always one confronting a research effort. Our success would come in the reader gaining a grasp of the contextual framework within which the various projects operate. We are working on policy issues that cut across a broad spectrum of projects. The goal is to sort out the generic commonalities and differences, not to detail or evaluate the nuances of individual efforts.

Ray C. Rist
Principal Investigator
February 1980

ON-SITE OBSERVERS FOR THE YOUTHWORK NATIONAL POLICY STUDY

Fred W. Banes
New York, New York

Felton Burns
Fresno, California

Dale Bryan
Fairfax, Virginia

Taylor Carney
Orlando, Florida

Carol Casale
New Haven, Connecticut

Theresa Cordiero
Visalia, California

Willard Crouthamel
Covington, Georgia

Paul DeLargy
Quitman, Georgia

Jim Doyle
Wayne, Michigan

Carl Feigenbaum
Lincroft, New Jersey

Hisauro A. Garza
San Jose, California

Susan M. Girard
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Irene Hansen
Sodus, New York

Jan Harrell
Tucson, Arizona

Marie Harrison
Quitman, Georgia

Tim Hatfield
Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minn.

Barbara Hofer
Somerset, Kentucky

Manford Holmes
Chicago, Illinois

Sher Huss
Salt Lake City, Utah

Hattie Hutchings
Salem, Missouri

Elizabeth Ianni
Middletown, New York

Nola M. Joyce
Alton, Illinois

Debbie Keller
Michigan City, Indiana

Steven Levenberg
New York, New York

Jim Lewis
Quitman, Georgia

Sharon Levine
Elmira, New York

Valerie Maines
Rockford, Illinois

Bill McNeese
Wayne, Michigan

Ruth Morgenson
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Constance Oxley
Danby, Vermont

Robert S. Palacio
San Jose, California

Patti Patton
San Diego, California

Shanna Ratner
Boston, Massachusettes

Susan O. Reed
Newark, New Jersey

Jean Reilly
Highpoint, North Carolina

Ramon Rincon
Dallas, Texas

Juan Riveria
Pharr, Texas

Patti Romano
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Terri Ruff
Atlanta Georgia

John Ryan
Santa Barbara, California

W.R. Schwyhart
Berkeley/Hayward, California

Charles Skeans
Madras, Oregon

Myra K. Shipp
Potosi, Missouri

Diana Talley
Covington, Georgia

Stephen Tomlinson
Quitman, Georgia

Rochelle Weinberg
Danby, Vermont

Greg Wiltfang
Rockford, Illinois

Chris Ziegler
Wayne, Michigan

Carrol Zippert
Eutaw, Alabama

Gene Zyzanski
Des Moines, Iowa

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CBO	Community Based Organization
CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
DOL	Department of Labor
ETA	Employment and Training Administration
GED	General Education Diploma
LEA	Local Education Authority
MIS	Management Information System
NCRY	National Commission on Resources for Youth
NYC	Neighborhood Youth Corps
OJT	On-The-Job Training
OYP	Office of Youth Programs
PNP	Public Non-Profit
PrNP	Private Non-Profit
PSE	Public Service Employment
RFP	Request for Proposal
ROP	Regional Occupational Program
SEP	Student Employment Program
SPEDY	Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth
VEP	Vocational Exploration Program
YCCIP	Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects
YEDPA	Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act
YES	Youth Employment Services
YETP	Youth Employment and Training Program
YNPS	Youthwork National Policy Study

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This monograph is an interim report on the four programmatic school-to-work transition models being developed and implemented by Youthwork, Inc. It is the third in a number of such reports to be prepared by the Youthwork National Policy Study, located at Cornell University. The report addresses both the within model variations as well as the distinguishing features between the various models. The four models--academic credit for work experience, career awareness, expanded private sector involvement, and youth initiated projects--can best be conceptualized as varying in-school strategies for involving youth as they undertake to make their transition from school to work.

The four models are neither conceptually definitive nor are they mutually exclusive in practice. They represent different emphases on a common theme. This report seeks to sort out the strengths of the varying approaches, suggest when an approach is most appropriate for a particular target population of youth, and to describe something of the latitude available for program implementation within the respective strategies.

A consistent theme across all four approaches is that none is "actor proof". We state this as our very first general finding because we wish to emphasize our conviction that the pursuit of actor proof programs in the area of youth education and employment/training programs is futile. Besides being a poor use of time and resources, such an approach ignores the key strength of the projects we have been studying--a strength based on the inspired and competent efforts of staff. To look elsewhere than to the people who organize and implement the programs is to miss the central point. The projects only work when people involved successfully make them work. The contrary tendency, as Mangum and Walsh (1978:14-15) have noted is:

> To be searching for the "actor proof program, or programs, that were so well conceived and constructed that their effectiveness does not depend upon the competence of the human beings who either operate them or participate in them... Evaluations may be correct when they blame the failures of programs or program components on the weaknesses of program personnel, but such criticism sheds very little light on the potential effectiveness of the programs or the components themselves.

We take it as a major task of this present report to highlight those areas of "potential effectiveness" so as to enhance the effectiveness of the actors involved, not to render them irrelevant.

The second of our general conclusions with regard to these four strategies is that while these efforts are necessary to youth in their transition from school to work, they are not sufficient. Our data suggest that there exists a persistent discomfort at the sites and in the offices of their sponsors that "not all is being done that ought to be done". We view this as a misdirected concern, especially in light of those expectations for the projects to accomplish more than what is possible. Given the constraints on the projects of funding, of scheduling, of existing on "soft money" as short term demonstration projects, of some numbers of youth being reluctant to commit themselves to yet another federal project, and the lack of prior collaboration between the CETA system and the local LEAs, the projects have performed remarkably well. But they cannot be expected to ensure employment opportunities with promotion possibilities, nor can they be expected to retain all youth in their programs.

That we have learned so little from our efforts over the past two decades ought not now press us into seeking instantaneous results. These projects will need careful scrutiny, not to provide premature "outcome" data, but to learn what we can of implementation, of the trials of program start-up, and of how to slowly but confidently build the inter-institutional linkages necessary for program operation. The task is one of learning how to weave together the social net to be placed below youth as they make their way into adulthood and the world of work. This view is consistent with that of the National Commission for Manpower Policy which has recommended that the focus of study on CETA programs be that of the strengths of the various approaches. As was noted (1978:107-108):

> In view of the rapid and continuing growth of federal manpower programs, together with the deliberate shifts in programmatic emphasis, it would seem reasonable to assume that the efficacy of manpower programs, in their various forms, was well established. This is not the case, however. Not only is the efficacy of any single program more an article of faith than documented evidence, but also there are very few clues regarding the relative efficacy of alternative programmatic approaches.

Youth need to get started somewhere in building their experience with work. It is inappropriate to measure program performance and outcomes when the youth have barely left the starting blocks. To assist youth in making choices as a result of exposure and experience in an in-school project ought to be acknowledged for what it is.

The third of our general findings is one that we have documented previously (cf. Interim Report #2). The one "treatment" which has consistently appeared as important to the youth and to the overall success of the projects has been "individualized attention". The student populations being served by the Youthwork projects tend, as a generalization, to be students who have not experienced success in conventional schools and in conventional classrooms. They are students whose constant accumulation of unmet academic and interpersonal needs are not well redressed by large-scale, mass programs. The students appear to have best responded in those settings where there has been quiet and consistent interaction with adults, where the individualized assessment of their basic skill needs have led to an individually tailored and closely monitored course of study, and where the adults in the programs have taken the time to assist the youth in sorting out their options and choices for the future (the very opposite of an "actor proof" program!). This finding holds across the various strategies and across the age ranges of the students. Students have fluorished when they have been treated as "whole persons".

In this present report, each of the four strategies have been examined along several dimensions. Those common to the four are 1) the conditions and provisions of awarding academic credit; 2) the means of ensuring youth involvement in the projects; and 3) the forms and functions of varying styles of program administration. In addition, each of the four models have been studied from the perspective of one or more additional issues specific to the model. Recommendations for the generic as well as strategy-specific concerns are located at the end of each chapter. What follows in this present summary is an overview of those findings generic to all four strategies.

I. Awarding of Academic Credit

The academic credit for work experience projects have, of necessity, demonstrated a range of approaches. Given that there are no standardized procedures, each project has had to evolve a set of agreements between itself, the school administration responsible for the certification of credit, and the youth. The agreements have, over the course of our study, been in a constant state of change. This has been due both to the changes in criteria develcped by the school administrators as well as the changing needs of the participant youth. But amidst this welter of variation, there has emerged a rather constant concern--for what competencies ought students be awarded credit and what form ought that credit to take.

The fact that there has been such a constant tempo of change in the projects suggests that it is highly important that there be developed a means of sharing information and problem solving experiences among the projects. Where possible, they need to be able to benefit from one another. If there is no single blueprint for developing the linkage between work experience and academic credit, then those who are, as it were, in a constant state of improvisation need all the assistance they can muster. Which leads to a second concern. Technical assistance in the area of implementing the linkage between academic credit and work experience needs to be both systematic and sustained. Assistance in the development of competency statements and in specifying measurement of these same competencies appears absolutely essential at present. And so long as there are changes within the projects, that assistance should be continued. It is not evident to date that such assistance has been of the consistency and sophistication to prevent frequent "rediscovery of the wheel" by the various projects.

Third, there is the concern to be reiterated from the general findings discussed in the last section. The fact that the academic credit for work experience projects have been in a state of flux renders meaningless any discussion of "outcomes" in a conventional sense. That competencies have been defined and redefined, that the basis for granting credit has been fluid, and that the youth have more than once expressed bewilderment at the situation in which they have found themselves ought to give pause to any consideration of summative evaluations. It is the process that is most in need of study, not the measure of products.

Finally, there is evidence that those academic credit for work experience projects which have been most successful implementing the linkage between credit and experience have been those projects with close ties to the school system if not a particular school building. Proximity and frequent interaction appear to be important concerns to school administrators as they have negotiated with project officials regarding the granting of credit. The fact that the granting (or withholding) of credit is an important institutional function of schools means that they are not likely to relinquish this perogative without assurances and some means of monitoring the projects. Being in the same school building as other more traditional educational activities appears important in this regard. For the projects, there is perhaps less autonomy, but greater ease in implementation and in the securing of credit for their activities with the youth.

II. Youth Involvement

Succinctly, in other than the specific strategy area of "youth involvement", there is little evidence of it in the Youthwork projects. Indeed, there is even considerable variation within the strategy area. The reasons for this current situation are several. First, only a few projects (five to seven) have created an organizational mechanism by which youth involvement could be more than simply eposodic and sporadic. In these successful instances, the youth have been given responsible roles in the project, be they as "peer counselors" or as "directors" of their own small enterprises. It is in such institutional roles as these that the youth have had a basis from which to discuss their concerns and attitudes regarding the projects and the activities taking place within them.

A second reason for the low levels of youth involvement in the projects is that there are, save the instances above, no efforts underway to train the youth to learn how to become more actively involved in the projects. The tenor of most all projects is that the youth are "clients" and, as such, are served. The concept of "empowering" the youth to take a more directive role in the affairs of their projects is simply absent.

Youth also tend to be transient through the project. While staff remain, cohorts of youth come to the project and, after some period of time, leave again. The program is thought to "belong" to the adults. This limitation plus the fact that the "institutional memory" of the project is held by adults makes it exceedingly difficult for youth to play a meaningful role.

In the large majority of projects, what involvement has been evident was that which was most immediate to the concerns and activities of the youth themselves--their roles and their responsibilities. Issues of budget, of the staffing of the project, of the design of the curriculum, and negotiations with other organizations and agencies were all retained by adult staff. The point in stressing the lack of involvement is to alert those interested in the issue to the constraints as well as to suggest what might be avenues for change. There appears to be little or no empirical evidence that youth involvement is a prerequisite to a successful transition. But, alternatively, there is little or no literature which suggests it is a hindrance. Thus the issue is one of utility. Is youth involvement congruous with the philosophy and orientation of the individual project? If so, it should be encouraged. If not, other strategies are also available to assist in the transition process.

III. Program Administration

Different approaches to program administration among the thirty-six projects reviewed for this report have proven successful. The approaches fall on a continuum from a strong central administration which oversees program operations to a participatory approach where decisions are more frequently made in a decentralized manner. In either event, the most smoothly operated programs all exhibit a clear sense of program purpose and direction.

Expressions of dissatisfaction were heard most frequently when the lines of responsibility were not explicit and when the programs could not organize themselves to deal with recurrent problems in an effective manner. In those instances where "no one knew for sure what they were supposed to be doing", program disorganization and low staff morale were clearly apparent. Again, it should be stressed that no one administrative style was more closely identified with these dissatisfactions any more than one was identified with the successful practices. What also provoked considerable frustration among staff was the sense that they, as an organization, were spending considerable amounts of their time on recurrent problems--problems that they believed could be solved by changes in program organization or more delegation of responsibility. Issues such as recruiting students, developing competencies for academic credit, maintaining high retention rates, and authorization for expending funds were consistently mentioned as points of contention.

In contrast, programs operating most smoothly, be they hierarchical or participatory, possessed several factors in common. These were: 1) development from a pre-existing program or cluster of programs; 2) low staff turnover; 3) location within or near to the schools where students were being served; 4) staff members were either members of the faculty or were at the site daily as participants in the program; 5) operators experienced in working with in-school youth programs and with educational administrations in general; and 6) the program taking place or at least beginning during the regular school day. As the number of these factors declined at the sites, there was a corresponding decline in efficiency of program organization and administration.

To return to a theme noted earlier, there is evidence from our survey of the administration of the programs that there is a clear need for technical assistance to the projects on matters of organization, governance, decision making strategies, and problem solving. The time and energy of many staff and many administrators at simply too many projects were taken up in dealing with these issues. A consistent strategy of assistance might have lessened the times when improvisation was built on improvisation, consuming more and more of the energies of those on the projects. It is also recommended that those who are about to undertake the development and implementation of such projects be provided with in-depth training so as to forestall if not eliminate the emergence of these problems at yet additional numbers of sites. We are likely to find, if no assistance is provided, that history repeats itself.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The youth unemployment situation in the United States is a matter of the utmost national concern. With unemployment rates for all youth approximately 20 percent and for those of minority youth nearly double that figure, the country is in the midst of seeing literally hundreds of thousands of young people pass into adulthood without ever having been employed. And the implications of this prolonged period of unemployment and schism between the young and the world of work are not encouraging. As has been documented in a growing number of studies, the relation between long term unemployment and the work experiences of persons while young is clear: Those who are marginal to or completely outside the labor force while they are young tend to be the same persons in the same predicament when they are adults. The process appears to be a cumulative one, and the cycle of unemployment persists.

It should also be stressed that the size of this population is not insignificant. On the average in 1977, 1.6 million young people between the ages of 16 and 19 were unable to find jobs and their unemployment rate was almost three times that for persons 20 years and older. Stated differently, youth account for appoximately one-tenth of the labor force, but almost one-quarter of all unemployed. In his address of January 10, 1980 where he announced his new initiatives in the area of youth unemployment, President Carter stated that there were:

> 2 million high school students in lower income school districts alone who are at least two years behind in their basic skills that are taken for granted in today's job market, and I need not tell you that the 2-year measurement is much better than many of these young peoples' educational level demonstrated. A large number of high school graduates in the United States of America are still functionally illiterate. They cannot read or write. They cannot add or subtract well enough to hold a simple job.
>
> There is a second large group of disadvantaged young people also, coincidentally, about two million, who are already out of school but having severe problems getting a job, and if they ever get a job, of holding a job.

In sum, there is an "at risk" population in these two categories alone of nearly 4 million youth who are likely candidates for the unemployment rolls.

The response to this situation by the federal government has been through the initiatives contained in the Youth Employment and Demonstrations Projects Act (YEDPA) of 1977. Created with a specific focus on the needs of youth, the effort was to signal a quantum leap in the support of youth employment and training projects. Indeed, in its first two years (1977-1979) YEDPA programs accounted for one fourth of the measured employment growth for all teenagers and approximately three-fourths of all employment growth for black teenagers.

But if YEDPA was to be more than simply ameliorative--desperate as such ameliorative efforts were needed--there had to be new approaches and new strategies for addressing the persistence of youth unemployment. The reason being, as Magnum and Walsh (1978) have cogently stated, that little or no systematic effort has been made over the past years to learn from previous efforts, both positive and negative. The decisions on what programs to instigate, what policies to pursue, and what objectives to seek have heretofore not been made. Their rather somber assessment includes much of what they understand to be in the YEDPA initiatives as well. They note:

> It is ironic that after 17 years of experimentation with employment and training programs for youth, Congress found it necessary to legislate activities and programs aimed at discovering the causes of youth unemployment and its potential solutions. It seems fair to ask whether the assumptions upon which past youth programs were based were faulty, or whether the programs themselves were poorly designed or mismanaged. Yet, aside from the research provisions of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA), the programs authorized by the Act are the same as those which have been implemented over the past 17 years--work experience on community improvement and conservation projects, institutional and on-the-job training, counseling, placement and other kinds of supportive services...Congress undoubtedly hoped that programs initiated under YEDPA would be innovative and would unearth heretofore untried techniques, but one of the criticisms of past programs has been that they have been almost exclusively experimental. Experiment has been piled upon experiment, but a concerted, overall policy for treating youth unemployment and transitional problems has never emerged. (p. 11)

If Mangum and Walsh are correct in their assessment that "aside from the research provisions", little new or innovative could be anticipated from the YEDPA effort, then, of necessity, attention should focus on what the research sponsored YEDPA might yield in the way of new insights or programmatic initiatives.

Of particular concern in the present instance has been the initiative taken by the Office of Youth Programs in DOL to sponsor the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Project. This project has been administered with the assistance of Youthwork, Inc. Each individual program, competitively selected, was to be an exemplary effort in one of four areas: (1) expanded private sector involvement, (2) job creation through youth-operated projects, (3) academic credit for work experience, or (4) career information, guidance, and job seeking skills. The special focus of these programs has been on the relation between in-school (or those who can be persuaded to return to school) youth and employment/training opportunities. The underlying rationale is one of bridging the traditional schism in American society between school and work by developing a number of mechanisms which allow these two experiences to overlap. Rather than youth experiencing their education and work as dichotomous and unrelated, the aim is to explore innovative means by which to make them coterminous and interrelated.

The individual local programs selected for this demonstration project were slated to operate from between nine and eighteen months, i.e., between September 1978 and March 1980. Programs could include summer activities in 1979 if those activities were shown to be a logical extension of the school year program. They were funded from $15 million set aside by the Department of Labor for discretionary projects under the authority of the YETP legislation. The projected size of the youth populations to be served in the programs varied from a low of 35 to a high of 10,000. Sites were located across the nation in 31 states and in locations that ranged from rural to metropolitan areas. Individual grants ranged from approximately $175,000 to $400,000 with the average being near $300,000.

The period covered by this present report--September 1978 through December 1979--has provided a sufficient time frame within which to examine the four substantive areas in which programs were to operate. Each of these four models was designed to address one or more of the contributions that in-school programs could make to increase both the academic preparedness of the youth and the skills they would need to successfully secure employment. The task of this present report is to explicate both the organizational differences between the four models as well as to define more clearly within model variations. The goal is to provide to program personnel and policy makers alike an understanding of the range of options available within the four models and when it is that one or another of the approaches appears most suitable for a particular target population of youth.

A particular strength of this report is that it is able to examine the programs over time. In this way, our analysis is able to take into account changes that have occurred and the merits of these same changes. The concerns with modifications in curriculum, in restructuring administration, in coming to agreements on the awarding of academic credit, and in finding ways by which to increase the involvement of youth are documented in detail in this present report. Each of these concerns, set within the context of the on-going life of the individual programs, provides a window through which to examine how it is that the programs organized themselves and responded to the needs of staff, administrators, and youth. What is presented here is an analysis of those contextual variables that have come to play such a dominant role in the life of the programs. Further, it has been these same contextual variables that have come to be such important determinants of variations between program strategies. The choices made on academic credit, on forms of youth participation, and on curriculum have all had an important impact in differentiating the strategies, one from another.

YEDPA and Knowledge Development

While the direct support for youth employment programs commands the bulk of YEDPA appropriations, improved knowledge development is of high priority. Indeed, the Congress authorized in the legislation that up to a full 20 percent of the YEDPA funding could be used for demonstration projects seeking innovative means by which to address the problem of youth employment. The first General Principle of the YEDPA Planning Charter of August 1977 stated:

> Knowledge development is a primary aim of the new youth programs. At every decision-making level, an effort must be made to try out promising ideas, to support on-going innovation and to assess performance as rigorously as possible. Resources should be concentrated and structured so that the underlying ideas can be given a reasonable test. Hypotheses and questions should be determined at the outset, with an evaluation methodology built in. (p. 5)

With the first phase of YEDPA funding in FY 1978, an ambitious agenda of demonstration, research and assessment activities was implemented. The Knowledge Development Plan structured an array of discretionary efforts which would hopefully address a number of the most pressing questions facing national policy makers. (DOL, 1978.) Within this 1978 plan were a number, eight to be exact, "first order" questions which needed to be answered to both design and implement the national priorities regarding youth unemployment. Of the eight first order questions posed by the 1978 Knowledge Development Plan, two are relevant to this present report. They are:

1) Are there better approaches and delivery mechanisms for the types of career development, employment and training services which are currently being offered?

and

2) What works best for whom? What performance or outcome standards are best to determine what does and does not work for youth? Which youth with what characteristics benefit from which programs and approaches?

It became apparent that as YEDPA moved into its second fiscal year (1979) that a number of "second order" questions also deserved attention. For the most part, these questions were refinements and further clarifications of the original eight. They focused more specifically, for example, on targeting for sub-populations of youth, on isolating the effects of specific service components, and to compare among alternative delivery approaches. Seven such second-order questions were posed for the fiscal year 1979 effort. Three of these seven can also be addressed with this present report. They are (DOL, 1979:5):

1) What strategies are most important at different points in the lives of youth? Must training be delayed until greater maturity is achieved? Are employment and training programs a way of inducing maturity?

2) How do the problems of significant youth segments differ including those of migrants, rural youth, the handicapped, offenders, young women with children, runaways, and the like? Are special needs groups and special problems better handled by mainstreaming or by separate programs for these groups?

and

3) How can the lessons from knowledge development activities best be transferred to improve existing youth programs. How can the institutional change process be promoted?

Of course, these broad questions from the fiscal years 1978 and 1979 Knowledge Development Plans subsume many more detailed and specific sub-questions. Several are taken up in this present report. They include (1) what insitutional settings appear most appropriate for particular sub-groups; (2) what strategies are most appropriate for enhancing the quality of the work experience; and (3) strategies for enhancing the appropriateness of the job placement.

It should be stressed again that the vantage point from which these questions are addressed is that of the actual programs themselves. The views are not those from the "top down", but from the "bottom up". An important distinction and one that ought not to be dismissed when further policy and program initiatives related to the YEDPA effort are undertaken.

Youthwork, Inc. and Knowledge Development

The programmatic activities of Youthwork, Inc. are a direct response to the efforts by the Department of Labor to address key knowledge development issues. With Youthwork focusing on in-school youth and the manner in which the educational and CETA delivery systems are able to contribute to the resolution of the youth unemployment problem, there has been achieved that necessary concentration of resources "so that the underlying ideas can be given a reasonable test". The Youthwork knowledge development effort has predicated its endeavor upon the following assumptions:

--More is known about the intentions of innovative youth programs than about program operations.

--More is known about program outcomes than the processes that generated such outcomes.

--More is known of the reasons for program failure than for program success.

With these assumptions explicated, Youthwork formulated four knowledge development goals, each of which sought to address the imbalance described in one or more of the assumptions listed above (Youthwork, 1978).

1) To identify barriers to program implementation and how to overcome them.
2) To identify unique features within programs that most help youth to achieve program objectives.
3) To examine both the degree and direction in which participating institutions have changed, and how these changes took place.
4) To assess basic assumptions underlying both the policy and practice of in-school programs in helping youth make the transition from school to work.

To achieve these goals, Youthwork structured its knowledge development activities towards data collection and analysis in three areas: the central policy question of the respective roles and responsibilities of the educational and CETA delivery systems vis-a-vis youth employment and training; programmatic issues relating to the implementation and collaboration of approaches undertaken by individual programs in the four focal areas; and the local knowledge development issues unique to each program operator and community.

It is to aspects of the first and second of these data collection and analysis areas that this present interim report is addressed. This report focuses on between as well as within model differences. It describes and analyzes certain unique features which distinguish programs. The degree and direction that the participating programs have changed is illuminated as are several of the fundamental assumptions about the transition from school to work and the manner in which different programmatic models are thought to assist in that transition. Direct observation of program activities, both formal and informal interviews with participants, and the longitudinal perspective have all been employed to ascertain when programs are working, why they are working, and for whom they are most appropriate.

Targeting on In-School Youth: Defining the Issues

As suggested in the quote by Ginzberg at the beginning of this report, there are two contrasting views on the origins and persistence of youth unemployment. The first view posits that many applicants are not hired because they lack certain basic competencies or that the skills they do possess are outmoded or for which there is little demand. The fault for this situation is laid on the doorstep of education, the sector of the society responsible for instructing the young in basic competencies and for orienting them towards appropriate adult roles. The alternative view holds that the issue is not one of the skills or competencies of the applicants, but rather that for some years now there has been a weak and inconsistent demand for labor--particularly the labor of the young. In this context, the point is raised that one can create a thousand and one different bridges for the transition from school to work, but if there is no work when the transition is completed, all is for naught.

Ginzberg writes that he believes both positions to be overstated. But overstatement is not the same as being incorrect. If both positions are fundamentally true, then each is tied in a reciprocal relation to the other. Which, in turn, suggests that any effort that addresses only one of the two propositions will have a very low probability of success. No single strategy can be assumed to comprehensively address what is a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional phenomenon.

But having said that a single strategy will not suffice is simply to have stated the negative. Indeed, it is not clear what will work, hence, the emphasis within the YEDPA legislation upon innovation and research. We must consider ourselves fortunate at this time if we later learn that we have been working with the correct questions, for it is obvious that we are some way off from providing the correct answers. Witness this summary of responses by program operators to the question of how to enhance the motivation and performance of the youth in their programs (Mangum and Walsh, 1978:68-69):

> The majority of operators at the local sites agree that motivational and performance difficulties associated with youth are among the most severe operational problems. But there is disagreement on how best to resolve these issues. Some argue that programs dealing with youth should not contain other target groups, thereby allowing operators to concentrate totally on their special problems. Others assert the opposite, that the role models provided by older, more experienced workers are essential for the younger, less stable employees. Some operators contend that the problems of youth may not be particularly different from those of other hard to employ groups and that a well structured program with quality work sites providing meaningful work, training, and opportunities for permanent transition is the key to success with all target populations. Other combinations of program

> treatment are being attempted with youth, such as the inclusion of remedial education and institutional job training in the basic work experience format. What is clear is that definitive answers to these or other questions concerning the most effective methods for dealing with youth are not yet at hand. (emphasis added)

If definitive answers are not at hand, the first task then is one of sorting out which questions are likely to be answered and when. Secondly, it will be necessary to undertake systematic efforts to gain the answers in such a way that the impact is cumulative. In much the same way as the OYP has prioritized a set of generic first and second order questions, the same has to be done on a more specific level for each of the areas in which we are woefully lacking in data and answers. We have to begin to chart our course, or we will end up once again as Mangum and Walsh described it earlier, without an overall policy for addressing the issues of youth unemployment and school to work transition.

We are at present in a stage of approximation--a stage where there are useful operating lessons to be learned from answering correctly posed questions. Our sophistication in sorting out what works best for whom is slowly accumulating, but again, we are learning more about the negatives, i.e., what not to do, and still uncertain on the prescription.

There are several additional insights to be gained from a closer examination of the duality and reciprocity of the causal relations posed by Ginzberg. These can be presented as complementary to his basic position and can also illuminate the framework within which the following analysis of the four programmatic alternatives has been undertaken.

First, the fact that effective strategies must include attention to both sides of the relation--training and employment--necessitates that those institutions which perform one or the other of these functions best must, of necessity, work collaboratively with other institutions to achieve the maximal impact. The issue is not one of "either-or", but rather that of what each is able to most effectively contribute to the success of the whole. It is no longer either education or employment, but an effective combination of the two. The task is to work out effective linkages between institutions so as to build on respective strengths. That such a view has been accepted by the Congress and the Department of Labor is also evident in the mandated 22 percent "set aside" in the YETP portion of the YEDPA legislation. These funds have been specifically targeted for those programs which are created as a result of collaborative efforts between the CETA and LEA in any local community. Literally hundreds of such awards have been made in the past two fiscal years, suggesting that collaboration is beginning and the exploration of mutual assistance is underway.

Second, the question of "What works best for whom" remains of the highest priority. If resources are to be used most effectively to assist those most in need, there must be an increased understanding of the education and employment needs of groups of youth and how it is that these can be fulfilled. The concern is for specificity, or as is used in the title of this report, with "targeting". The match between the needs of youth and the correct program response is a major concern of the current YEDPA demonstration efforts. The creation of Youthwork and other non-profit intermediaries is but one example of the means being employed to study specific program alternatives across various youth populations.

Finally, to remediate for the present lack of skills and competencies among literally millions of young people will necessitate a strategy different than that which must be employed to halt the continuing reoccurance of this condition in the future. For teenagers and young adults who lack basic skills, the options are relatively limited especially if they have already left the educational system. Remedial programs can be created, but current practices are not encouraging as to retaining youth in the programs, if in fact they can be persuaded to enter in the first place. The transmission of basic skills by non-traditional means is perhaps the preeminent educational challenge for this cohort of youth. On the employment side, the same can be said about the creation of stable employment opportunities.

For those youth who are still affiliated with a school, the clear implication is that programs on their behalf must be initiated much earlier in their schooling process. They also must be done with a more systematic attention to the acquisition of skills and the demonstration of basic competencies. The creation of remedial programs for students in the last year or two of their formal education is simply too little and too late. The effort has to begin early and concentrate upon those in greatest need. (Here again there is a clear consistency between this position and the recently announced youth unemployment initiatives by the President on January 10, 1980.) The investment, early on and intensive, appears to be worth the cost. As Adams and Mangum (1978:137) have noted:

> Investment in education and training during youth is closely correlated with subsequent investment over the life cycle. Those who invest early, continue to invest later. Thus, part of the economic returns to education and training during youth is realized through access to subsequent

> education and training opportunities. Not only is this important to early labor market success, but also to avoidance of later economic and social problems associated with declining investment and ensuing skill obsolescence with age.

Though the recent National Academy of Education report (Kerr, et al., 1979:17) offered a more guarded assessment when it stated, with respect to the longterm impact of work-education programs, "The average effects are modest at best," the point remains: participation in education and employment training programs does have an impact upon the life-chances of youth. The empirical question is not one of whether an impact, but in what degree.

The sites selected by Youthwork to serve as Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects have been presented with a challenging set of problems. The sites were chosen for their potential to demonstrate that innovative programs could be created so as to impact upon the transition from school to work for specific target populations of American youth. All parties to these exemplary programs have had to deal with a continuing set of changing conditions, changes that had the potential for severe disruptions in the provision of services to the youth. It is to the credit of the CETA and school delivery systems, as well as to the Department of Labor and to Youthwork, that in spite of many start-up problems and the chaotic press of the first year program implementation, the preliminary findings are strong and consistent. The various program models are taking on distinctive attributes and will contribute significantly to our understanding of which in-school programs are most appropriate for which cohorts of youth. The four models provide a cogent analytic framework within which to discuss in-school alternatives and their relation to targeting on youth in need.

Having said this, it is important to stress that the findings reported in this interim report are based on the first fifteen of the eighteen months that the projects have been slated to function. As such, this report must be taken for what it is, an interim assessment of what we understand to have been in existence through December 1979. The four models have undergone, in greater and lesser degree, changes since their initial conceptualization, let alone in their early implementation. This report seeks to explicate several of these key changes and provide insights on the strategies which appear most appropriate to insure the successful application of the intended model. This report can provide an important backdrop for discussion of the variety of alternatives available to CETA and individual LEAs as they seek to combine their efforts on behalf of in-school youth.

On This Report

The primary source of data for this report has been the materials produced by the individual on-site observers at each of the 36 reporting projects. These observers, with few exceptions, began their affiliation with the sites during the very first days of program start-up. Their field notes reflect the sensitivities which can come only from a long and in-depth involvement with their respective programs. It has been the task of the Youthwork National Policy Study staff at Cornell University to bring together the ethnographic notes, the materials from countless interviews, the extensive documentation, and the various numerical data as the basis for analysis. It is in this way that we have sought to describe the mosaic that is the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Project.[1] Together with these multiple forms of field data, use has been made of the MIS data system established by Youthwork. These latter data have been particularly helpful in allowing a melding of the descriptive data with various tabulations: number of participants, time in the program, projected target group enrollments, etc. The final thread weaving through this analysis is that of the extensive literature which has emerged with regard to youth unemployment in general and the YEDPA initiatives in particular. While little of this literature has been formally published in journal articles or books, the number of reports, conference papers, occasional papers, and federal documents grows almost daily.

---

[1] A detailed account of the methodology employed for this study can be found in Chapter Two.

Each of the following four chapters reports on a different program model within the Youthwork initiative. A number of analyses cut across these four chapters: form and content of curriculum, patterns of program administration, agreements on the awarding of academic credit, and mechanisms for increasing youth involvement.

Recommendations for both the Department of Labor and Youthwork, Inc. are located at the end of each chapter. The recommendations are emergent from and consistent with the individual programmatic focus found in the four areas. That there are differences in the recommendations across these four areas, (e.g., recommending increased individualized instruction in one area and increase adult instruction in another) is to be expected. Indeed, it is precisely this ability to begin to differentiate which programmatic options appear to best function with varying organizational forms and for which groups of students that marks this Interim Report as an important contribution to our understanding of "what works for whom and why?".

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY: THE APPLICATION OF ETHNOGRAPHIC TECHNIQUES

Introduction

In September 1978, Youthwork, Inc. requested a group of researchers at Cornell University to undertake a longitudinal ethnographic study of the entire cohort of funded projects. The Cornell effort, entitled the "Youthwork National Policy Study" began immediately to locate and train on-site observers for each of the projects. The first training session for observers was held in October 1978 in St. Louis, Missouri. Subsequent training sessions for additional observers were held in Washington, D.C. and in San Francisco. All told, observers were trained for 44 of the 46 operational sites. A second round of training sessions, to allow for necessary "mid-course corrections", were held in the Spring 1979. Training was also provided in May 1979 to observers from an additional seven sites added to the original cohort of projects.

The first training sessions were used to acquaint the newly hired observers with the initial foci of the research effort and to examine the basic skills observers would need for their fieldwork. The emphasis was on describing how to traingulate data sources (printed matter, observations, formal interviews) and effective ways to acquire data which would contribute to answering the key policy questions. The focus of the Spring training session was to further specify the issues to be examined in the remainder of the year. The session also dealt with particular problems encountered by observers during their first six months on their sites. A third emphasis was a review of the nature and strengths of in-depth focused interviewing.

A significant departure from traditional ethnographic research was instigated with this present study. Rather than send the observers into the field and wait for the "emergent issues" to become apparent, time constraints as well as specific policy questions of concern to the Congress, the Department of Labor, and to Youthwork, Inc. necessitated the pre-definition of the areas of investigation. Five "analysis packets" have been written, each of which has focused on a particular area of study. The analysis packets have not specified how the data relevant to the various policy issues should be collected, only what were the areas of concern. Appendix A (attached) is a copy of the Analysis Packet developed for this report. As such, the packet provides the framework within which the data for this present report have been gathered.[1] Throughout the study, observers have remained responsible for determining the important events and activities at their respective project sites and for insuring that these events are faithfully reported in their field notes.

---

[1] This is not to suggest that this report has been based exclusively on data collected with respect to the Analysis Packet. Material from other analysis packets has also been used when appropriate.

Perhaps more important to stress than the changes made within the methodology is the fact that qualitative research is being used at all. The application of this method to the study of the Exemplary In-School Projects represents something of a break with traditional approaches to the study of education and employment training. Rather than rely exclusively on the models of "input-output" evaluations, or those which stress summative approaches, Youthwork, Inc. has opted for a multi-method evaluation. It is employing both quantitative and qualitative approaches. In this manner, Youthwork has available analyses based on the study of social processes and day-to-day realities not amenable to quantification. Not all that should be known about these projects can be learned through mathematical formulas or standardized testing. An in-depth familarity, a closeness to the staff and students, a longitudinal perspective which permits the oserver to study changes and reactions to changes over time are all strengths derived from an ethnographic approach.

There is a growing consensus among those involved in large scale policy evaluations that there is an important, indeed critical, role to be played by qualitative research. Too often in the past, the assumption has been made that statistical realities coincide with cultural realities. That this is not so has been the Achilles heel of so many efforts at evaluating employment and training programs. Succinctly, to build from the ground up, one needs to know what is going on at the ground level. As Weiss had already noted in 1970:

> One hopeful direction is to place less stress on evaluation of over-all impact, studies that come out with all-or-nothing, go/no-go conclusions. More resources should be allocated to evaluations that compare the effectiveness of variant conditions within programs (different emphases and components of programs, attributes of sponsoring agency structure and operation,

> characteristics of participants) and begin to explain which elements and sub-elements are associated with more or less success. Such an approach produces data of interest across a wide range of programs and has high utility in pointing direction for further program development.

In reviewing a large number of studies of the utilization (or lack thereof) of program evaluations, Alkin and Daillak (1979) have concluded that the utilization of process evaluations is hindered by the attempt to translate complex and multi-dimensional variables into linear and discrete variables. Program persons themselves know this can badly destroy their program. Thus they increasingly tend not to place much reliance on such material. In the end, it is of little benefit to program operators and policy makers to have to rely on artificially created "clean" data in a complex and messy world. Alkin and Daillak also conclude:

> In a very real sense, there is another major finding of the study; an enhanced conviction on our part that naturalistic methods are the most powerful and appropriate methodology for the study of utilization. (p. 49)

We would conclur and suggest that the same would hold true for studies of program implementation and inter-institutional collaboration as well.

What follows in this present chapter is a discussion of the methodology used in this research. The key points to be reviewed are the theoretical and empirical rationale for qualitative research, the various techniques employed, the manner in which the data were coded and analyzed, and the strengths and limitations of the overall approach.

I. Theoretical and Empirical Rationale

Many labels have been attached to the research strategy in which researchers directly observe human activity and interaction in a naturalistic environment. The earliest use of this technique was by anthropologists in their field studies of pre-literate peoples. Malinowski (1922) labeled his technique of observing and participating in the various activities of a Trobriand village as "ethnography". He described his goal in utilizing this technique as follows:

> The field ethnographer has seriously and soberly to cover the full extent of the phenomena in each aspect of tribal culture studies, making no difference between what is commonplace or drab, or ordinary, and what strikes him as astonishing and out of the way. At the same time, the whole area of tribal culture, in all its aspects, has to be gone over in research. The consistency, the law and order which obtain within each aspect make also for joining them into one coherent whole.

More recently, Valentine (1968) has called for new ethnographic research to be conducted among various groups of North American urban poor. He states it will be only through direct participation in the life of those being studied will there emerge an understanding of the structure of the society in which they live. Valentine contends just as provincial judgments were made by colonialists concerning the peoples they encountered, so also provincial judgments are presently being made about the poor by middle-class social scientists. The provincialism must be overcome by sustained contact which leads to acceptance and understanding of the internal logic of the group being studied. Valentine notes (1968:8-9):

> From the time of pioneer field workers onward, it has been recognized that prolonged, intensive, direct exposure to the actual conditions of life is needed to understand a previously unknown culture. This involves direct observation of social behavior and participation in community life as well as systematic questioning and discussion with informants. Only by this immersion in on-going group existence can the anthropologist probe thoroughly beneath the surface of a culture and replace superficial impressions with more accurate insights.

Dating back at least a half century, American social scientists have utilized ethnographic research. They have completed such diverse studies as those of industrial strikes (Gouldner, 1954); patterns of community organization (Hatch, 1948; Lynd and Lynd, 1928; Warner, et al., 1944); behavior in public places (Goffman, 1963); psychiatric interviewing (Scheff, 1966); clientele in stores with pornographic material (Polsky, 1967); development of racial identification (Clark, 1947; Goodman, 1952); Whyte (1943) and his study of "Cornerville"; Liebow (1967) with cab drivers; and Bogdan (1975) to measure "success" in a poverty program.

Within the field of education, both participant and nonparticipant observation have been employed in the study of classroom activities and interactions. Bellack (1966), Biddle and Adams (1967), Henry (1963), Rist (1970, 1973, and 1978), Smith and Geoffrey (1968), and Kleinfeld (1979) have all utilized direct observation of classroom situations to analyze attitude formation, peer group relations, student teacher training, and variations in teacher control techniques. The ethnographic approach has been used in several recent large scale evaluations of desegregation (Rist, 1979), science education (Stake, 1978), and educational change in rural school districts (Herriott, 1978).

In the employment field, Wurzburg (1978,1979) adopted a case study approach to provide an on-going picture of how prime sponsors were implementing YCCIP and YETP programs. The Work in America Institute (1978) used short case studies to describe private sector intiatives for the hard-to-employ and the National Institute of Education funded the RMS Research Corp. (1979) to conduct intensive ethnographic evaluations of implementation efforts at four replications of the Philadelphia based OIC/A model of school to work transition.

II. The General Research Plan

The Youthwork National Policy Study chose the ethnographic approach because of its flexibility in design and execution and, most important, because qualitative data are most useful in capturing the processes and on-going problems and successes of program development and implementation. In addition, these types of data easily lend themselves to a formative feedback design which is essential to the improvement of employment and educational programs for low-income in-school youth. The field work has drawn heavily from the methodologies traditionally associated with anthropology, sociology, and social psychology.

Throughout the period of the field work, the field researchers, one at each of the sites, have functioned as ethnographers. Their overriding concern has been with capturing and describing various dimensions of the project. The role has been more that of a student interested in learning about how the various pieces of a puzzle fit together than a traditional evaluator who enters the setting with explicit a priori assumptions about what the system is and how it is supposed to function.

The complexities of implementing multi-task programs in schools are different to capture with straight interview data and/or survey questionnaires. The field researchers have been trained in the application of the traditional emic approach to field work. This approach dictates that the observer should ascertain the criteria that informants use to interpret and describe their own experiences. Variously described by other researchers as "folk system analysis", or studies of the "social construction of reality", the importance of the approach has been described by Ogbu:

> From this perspective the behavior of any group of people in schools, churches, or political rallies are not governed by an "objective reality out there", but by the "reality" they experience and interpret. Most studies document the middle class interpretations of the universe of these people. Although the theories that emerge may be self consistent, they do not represent accurately the "realities" they attempt to explain.

Data Sources

Field researchers have used multiple data sources for their description and analysis of the in-school exemplary program with which they are affiliated. The basic strategy of data collection is that of a triangulation of data sources, i.e., to combine varying kinds of data from different sources (cf. Denzin, 1970). Data from diverse sources tend to be complementary because of their reciprocal strengths and weaknesses (cf. Rist, 1977). The basic research activities of on-site observers have been those which simultaneously combined document analysis, respondent and informant interviewing, direct participation, and extensive observation of the various facets of the local project. There was also the occasional opportunity to use data gathered by others at the site, e.g., third party evaluators.

Participant Observation. Ethnographers attempt to immerse themselves in an environment to understand the situation or the system--allowing impressions and patterns to emerge from their participation with, and observation of people in their natural settings. Ethnographic field work is guided by grounded theory (cf. Glaser and Strauss, 1967). This involves developing hypotheses and analytical frameworks by interacting directly with the empirical reality. Traditionally, field work of this type was only assumed possible through a long and intensive period of residency on site. Of necessity, the field work conducted in this present study was done on a somewhat different schedule. An important variation from the classical model was that the observer was not "in residency", but was a member of the local community who visited the site on an average of one day per week. The amount and quality of data that were collected over the months and months of these weekly visits suggests, though, that the traditional model may be overstated for study of American organizations when conducted by Americans themselves. As Pelto and Pelto (1970:92) have written:

> Every individual is a participant observer--if not of other cultures, then at least of his own. But the typical nonanthropological resident in a foreign community returns to his native haunts with a very unsystemmatic and incomplete picture of the scene he has observed. Field work requires much more than simply "being there" and passively watching what people are about. Often the fieldworker, in observing a particular pattern of behavior or an event, needs to find out a great deal more about that event than he is able to observe firsthand. His personal theoretical frame of reference suggests to him sets of questions to ask; relationships of this event to other types of data must be explored, and a host of other materials must be considered in order to make individual observations useful. In cases where the fieldworker feels that a significant block of information is available to him simply through his observation of a particular type of event, he may nonetheless need to devise ways of ensuring the representativeness and objectivity of his observations in a series of repetitions of the given event. By structuring observations and systematically exploring relationships among

> different events--through interviewing, watching, and perhaps administering "tests"--participant observation can be converted to scientific use. (p. 92)

Over time, our data suggest repeated patters of behavior emerge and are identifiable, even if observation is non-continuous.

Key Informant Interviewing. "Working with informants is the hallmark of ethnographic field work", according to Spradley and McCurdy (1972). The difference between a respondent and an informant is that a respondent will respond to specific questions (usually honestly) whereas an informant answers specific questions and then supplies additional, unsolicited information (both related and unrelated to the question), giving the researcher a broader view of the situation. Spradley and McCurdy (1972) explain the process and difficulties in selecting informants.

> The ethnographic field worker must locate helpful people, win their cooperation, and establish a close, personal relationship with them. This task is not simple, because it involves a basic conflict. On the one hand, the ethnographer establishes a relationship of trust with his informants. It is desirable that this be productive and beneficial to both parties. Often it is marked by friendship. On the other hand, the ethnographer seeks to know things that informants may be reluctant to reveal. Indeed, they may perceive that the researcher is asking them to tell secrets about other people to whom they are loyal. At the very least, they will be asked to talk about what they know in a manner that is new to them. Some of the ethnographer's questions may be embarrassing; others are outright stupid.

This basic conflict is exacerbated when one is perceived as an evaluator. Generally, working alone rather than in teams creates a less threatening atmosphere which is more conducive to gathering data. The value to a researcher in having a key informant is that this person knows their setting from the inside and has had experience in their current social situation, e.g., the school. Another important characteristic of a good informant is his/her willingness and ability to talk or communicate.

Informal Interviews. Many of the data were collected during informal interviews with students and staff members during lunch or after school. The purpose of using informal interviews was to collect data in normal, "natural" settings. Information collected in the natural setting is more likely to reflect real conditions and constraints operating on the individual. The approach avoids many of the problems associated with role playing. In addition, this approach mitigates many of the problems that exist in the laboratory setting where artificial stimuli (stimuli isolated from the context in which an individual would actually be operating) produce an artificial response (a response that reflects the environment of the laboratory). Informal interviews have also been conducted at the homes of staff members, bars, sitting on the hood of a car, a coffee shop, staff offices, and on the streets.

Biographical Case Studies. Case studies of individual students, their background and progress through the program, continue to be compiled. These studies document the development of students as they progress through the program. Expressive autobiographic interviews have been extensively used thus far to develop the case studies. The expressive autobiographic interview according to Louise Spindler is:

> A cross between a structured interview and a chronological autobiography. The respondent is asked to tell the story of his or her life but intervention by the anthropologist at critical points...relevant to (specific topical points of interest)...turns the autobiography to relevant considerations and permits an economy of time that is not possible with the full autobiography. (Spindler and Spindler, 1970, p. 293)

The data collected from these intensive interviews with the youth have been integrated into the present study by means of illustration. In this manner, the impacts of programs can be portrayed in the lives of individual youth.

Written Documents. Field researchers obtain copies or make abstracts of all written records pertinent to their exemplary program. Such records have included evaluation reports, memoranda, announcements, internal communications, non-confidential assessments of student performance, formal contracts of association, newspaper clippings and the like. Also, the actual learning packets, textbooks, supplementary reading materials and assignments used in the various projects have contributed an understanding of the system. They have been used as well to document the instructional practices used at the different sites.

MIS Data. One aspect of the multi-method approach being used by Youthwork, Inc. to evaluate the Exemplary In-School Programs has been to collect certain standardized data across all operational sites. This has been done through the use of a Management Information System (MIS). Data collected from each site in this system include number of students enrolled, number of students who have successfully completed the program, the percentage of predicted student population served to date, the size of staff, and a host of demographic variables about the individual students. These data have been made available to the YNPS and have been incorporated into this and other reports.

Data Transmission. Two forms of data have been produced by the on-site observers. The first is a copy of each and every protocol generated by the observer during any data collection endeavor, be that effort one of interviewing, observing, or the collection of written materials. These are gathered together by the project director and staff at Cornell so as to maintain a continuous monitoring system of field produced material. To date (February 1980) 1807 such protocols have been produced and mailed to the YNPS Cornell office.

The second form of data transmitted from the on-site observers have been brief (3 to 5 page) analytic narratives written in response to questions sent by the Cornell staff. The questions have addressed specific dimensions related to the key policy questions guiding this research effort.

Organization and Analysis of Field Notes

Systematic and analytical observations depend upon the recording of complete, accurate, and detailed field notes. On-site observers are charged with recording their observations as soon after witnessing an event or an interview as possible. Field researchers were cautioned that using mechanical devices such as tape recorders for the recording of events tends to inhibit spontaneity and candor. Unless otherwise agreed upon with the individual site observer, no mechanical devices are used during on-site observations. During the research, training sessions were held at which observers were instructed in styles of note taking and the manner in which the field notes were to be converted into protocols. These protocols are the key data source for the subsequent analysis. One copy of each protocol remains with the field observer and one copy is sent to the YNPS Project Director. All protocols are read promptly by YNPS staff. There has been close contact between YNPS staff and on-site observers. The YNPS staff requests additional data to correct omissions, resolve contradictions and clarify ambiguous statements while the material is still fresh in the mind of the on-site observer. Additionally, other kinds of strategies or activities to be observed may be suggested to provide data needed to answer particular probing questions. Sample protocol pages from two on-site observers are enclosed.

Distilling these voluminous files of protocols has required a series of coding and editing steps. Code sheets have been developed to coincide with each of the analysis packets. Reading the protocols and categorizing the data by topic has been undertaken by the YNPS staff and done according to a framework necessary to answer the key policy questions. Further, this effort has allowed for a standard conceptual framework to be applied across all field sites. In the past, multiple frameworks applied to multiple sites have often detracted from the ability to generalize and develop recommendations.

Validity

The validity of naturalistic case study material depends greatly upon the manner in which the data are recorded, the sensitivities of the field researcher and the quality of the analysis of the data. There are at least three sources of validity for naturalistic data which are

name of researcher:
date of observation: 7/25/79
subject of observation: Interview w/student
site of observation: School
protocol #: 43

page 1 of 2

____ has been in the program for about three months. She has been attending the school for a little longer than that--about 4-1/2 months. She found out about the program and the school through her parole officer. She was given the choice between coming to the school and going to classes at ____. She chose this school because the classes are smaller here and because of the program--"the teachers are cool here. They take the time. If you have a hard time learning something or if you have a problem, they will help you with it." During the summer she is working for the newsletter of this school. She is in charge of the section of the paper called "Job Haves". She writes articles on where different people work, what their jobs are about and how they like it. They are going to be published in five newsletters this summer. She and the other students in her newsletter class like the work they are doing and will be continuing it this fall.

She is currently on lay-off of her job. She had worked there for several months assisting the medical personnel pulling charts, taking phone calls and stocking medical supplies. She liked the work but did not like the staff she worked with. She had disagreements with her supervisor about the clothing she wore when she was on the job, leaving the job early, and coming in late--"I felt like she was picking on me. I think I'd rather work someplace else besides the health clinic. It's too hectic." She also told me that she would prefer something closer to her home. She mentioned that the staff at the health clinic was small and that they didn't have the time to train her properly. Sometime in the near future, she will be meeting with her supervisor and a staff person from the school to work out some of the problems she had there. She doubts very seriously that she will go back. She feels very strongly that her supervisor was not fair with her. She thought it was unreasonable of her to request that she not wear short-sleeved blouses--"The other girls wore them, but she didn't yell at them."

She didn't get into the program immediately after her enrollment in the school. There was some confusion over whether she was eligible or not for the program. It took about six weeks for her certification to go through. During that time she took the orientation class that is required before placement in a job.

The credit that she was getting for her job placement was very important to her. She plans on com-

name of researcher:
date of observation: 3/2/79
subject of observation: Interview with Prime Sponsor Personnel Overseeing the Current YETP Youthwork Program
site of observation: Prime Sponsor Office
protocol #: 26
page 1 of 10

The following is an interview requested by Dr. on inquiring upon the relationships between CETA and the school.

Question: Where does the program interface with CETA?

Response: Up to now, we have been serving two different groups. The groups are almost identical but they (referring to youthwork program) draw from referrals addressing more troublesome students. We serve the same type of population, but not the same kids and they provide a broader range of services than we do. ("They" is a reference to the youthwork sponsored program. "We" refers to other youth programs sponsored and conducted by the prime sponsor.) After the recent meeting (he is referring to the meeting between youthwork, prime sponsor staff and program staff.) We will have established a direct linkage between other youth programs and the program. The reason for the direct linkage is that exemplary program had start up problems and difficulty in reaching the projected number of students and our other CETA youth programs have had difficulty in obtaining academic credit for our participants. By establishing concurrent enrollment between a couple of our youth programs the youthwork program will provide a broader base and more services and hopefully we will align the prime sponsor and the school district more closely and this relationship will continue after the current program.

Probe: Is one of the main reasons you suggested the concurrent enrollment with the youthwork program was to establish a precedent for academic achievement? (Explanation: In the meeting of February 16 found in Protocol Number 20, it was suggested that students currently enrolled in a YETP Program conducted at the local high school would be transferred to the rolls and be paid from their money for the first 100 hours and in addition to that the program would provide a job coordinator and classroom instruction and the students would receive academic credit for the classwork and on-the-job training.)

applicable to the present study: ecological (external) validity; phenomenological (internal) validity; and contextual validity. In naturalistic research, the data are considered to be valid if they reflect or describe what actually is--what has occurred, what conditions exist, what interactions have taken place, etc.

Ecological validity means that the setting is accurately portrayed. If the account of the activity faithfully describes the setting in its natural form, then the report is ecologically valid. Field accounts must preserve the integrity of the natural setting. It has been a key task of the project director and his staff to continually monitor the field protocols for authenticity between the data and the setting.

Internal validity is achieved within naturalistic research when the descriptions of the events, situations, and interactions among actors are such that they accurately reflect the perceptions and intentions of the actors themselves. An observer seeks to understand how those who were involved interpreted what they and others around them were doing. The goal is to present material in such a way as to enable readers to understand "from the inside" why actors behaved as they did.

Contextual validity comes from the accurate capturing of the "natural business" of the actors in the setting such that to an outsider reading the report, the rhythm and routine of the setting become apparent. The descriptions of the setting should "ring true" to those who participate in the setting. At the same time the fullness of description should make pertinent features of the setting understandable to outsiders.

III. Strengths and Limitations of the Data

The major strength of the data which have been collected is derived from the longitudinal nature of the research design. The single most apparent weakness in most research efforts attempting to document and analyze program implementation is that they lack a sufficient longitudinal perspective (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973). A number of studies have utilized what could more aptly be described as a cross-sectional approach in contrast to studying the program in question over time (cf. Rossi and Wright, 1977).

Another major strength of the data is that long-term participation in a social system allows an observer to become sensitive to the subtle nuances that have meaning only to those within the system. A weakness of quantitative designs is that they assume that behavior can be abstracted and measured accurately. The abstraction from various scores and test results can only give indication of output, not of process. Long-term participation in a social system permits the observer to understand the processes which occur.

A basic epistomological assumption underlies the selection of direct observation as the primary research strategy employed in this study: that direct observation can make positive contributions to the study of the context of human and institutional behavior. The problems of bias or preconception may be critical to the interpretation given in the data, nevertheless, there will exist an account of the behavior relatively independent of the interpretations drawn from that account.

The observations at the sites were necessarily selective. However, observers were instructed to look for situations which would contribute data to an analysis of the key policy issues. They were encouraged to vary both the day of the week and the times of day when they visited sites. This strategy was designed to collect data over a whole spectrum of issues and over the entire time span of the program. A limitation of this approach is that not all events and activities could be covered. Thus, there was an imperative for continuous visits to the site in order to gain over time a perspective of what constituted the "typical" or "normal" patterns of interaction.

Another limitation was the blanket promise of anonymity to those observed and interviewed. Particular methods of data collection had to be evaluated in light of whether it would insure protection to those involved. In promising all site personnel they would remain unidentified, they were assured that statements made by them would not be reported to their superiors. This consideration resulted in the loss of one important form of data. Data could not be reported if they would have given strong clues as to the identity of the site or respondent involved. The YNPS continues to believe in the appropriateness of this approach.

IV. Targeting on In-School Youth: Four Strategies for Coordinating Education and Employment Services.

This report is the third in a series of interim reports being produced by the Youthwork National Policy Study. The most intensive data collection period for this report was undertaken from September through December 1979. However, certain aspects of the report, e.g., the focus on retention, draws on data collected since the beginning of the individual projects. The projects reported upon here have been operational since September 1978 or later. Of the 51 projects where there has been an on-site observer, more than 30 of these projects have been operating for 12 months or longer.

The focus of this report is to elaborate upon and detail several key dimensions of each of the four strategies being implemented by Youthwork, Inc. The goal is to better elucidate the internal dynamics of each strategy so as to understand its parameters, strengths, and content areas. Where possible, an effort will also be made to describe for which target groups of youth the respective strategies appear most appropriate. The task is one of differentiating the strategies, not ranking them. Comparisons can come only after one first knows what it is that is being compared.

CHAPTER THREE

ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR WORK EXPERIENCE

Academic Credit for Work Experience was selected by Youthwork, Inc. as one of four programmatic areas designed to implement innovative approaches to the problems of youth unemployment. As a national policy concern, providing academic credit for work experience was chosen as a primary focus area because:

> Some students are so discouraged by past schooling experiences that they find it difficult to learn skills through traditional academic routes. Providing credit for work experience can be the key to encourage some of these youth to continue their education. In general, it is believed that work-education linkages can improve both the work and learning experiences. Although a number of schools in the country have programs that award credit for work, few programs successfully interrelate the education and work experiences. Schools need to take advantage of the fact that many jobs offer opportunities to stimulate learning (DOL Application Guidelines, Exemplary Program, 1978, pp. 14-15).

The academic credit projects are designed to help economically disadvantaged youth make the transition to the work world by providing youth with work exploration and placement in the public and private job sector. As an incentive to participate, to help them economically, and to simulate real work experiences, they receive minimum wage payment for their job placements. Additionally, the participating youth are awarded academic credit for their participation. This second dimension is an inducement for the target population, potential dropouts, or dropouts to remain/return to school and matriculate toward graduation. The projects offer a gamut of services to youth: psychological, educational and vocational testing; career education guidance counseling; remedial education; job readiness skills classes, career exploration; and job placement.

Program Characteristics

Nationally, there were 12 projects funded by Youthwork, Inc. for fiscal year 1980 as a means to examine various approaches to the provision of academic credit for work experience. Five of the projects are extensions of previous programs, whereas the remaining six projects are new programs. The projects are located primarily on the East Coast (n=6) and the South (n=4) with the remainder in the North Central (n=2) region of the United States. Areas of location of the projects ranged from population densities of major metropolitan proportions to rural areas with populations of less than 10,000.

The academic credit projects vary greatly in organization although they have in common the basic feature of awarding credit for work exploration/experience. Two of the projects are postsecondary programs (one is affiliated with a community college and the other with a state university) and involve young adults aged 18-21 years old. The remaining projects serve a 14-19 year old population. These latter nine projects are located in a variety of settings: three are in self-contained alternative schools, one is a public non-profit project located at a site other than a school building and five projects are physically located in school buildings. Three of the projects also cut across these categories. One has five high school sites and a community college site, another has sites at both alternative and traditional high schools while a third has both an alternative school and a public nonprofit site. The size of the target population to be served ranges from 38 to approximately 700 youths. Table 1 provides a summary of project site characteristics.

Data Analysis Methodology and Sample

This chapter examines several components of the organization and operation of the Academic Credit for Work Experience projects. The three areas studied include the award of academic credit, program administration and retention. Where applicable, the Academic Credit projects are analyzed according to where the project is physically located or by their LEA affiliation. Programs in this focus area operate within four different facilities: post-secondary institutions, public schools, alternative schools or outside any educational institution (public nonprofit). Education institution project affiliations include the LEA, state or post-secondary institution.

A number of different data collection methodologies were implemented at the project sites to provide information for this chapter.

TABLE 1

ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

				(10/01/78-09/30/79)		
Project	1975 City Population[a]	Number of Project Sites	Where Conducted	Actual/Projected Number of Students to be Served[d]		Program Status[e]
A	rural	1	PNP	44/38	115.8	Extension
B	636,725	1	AS	70/80	87.5	New
C	25,842	1	In-school	105/90	116.7	New
D	378,112	5	3 In-school & 2 AS	251/727	34.5	New
E	381,042	1	In-school	164/160	102.5	New
F	1,815,808[b]	1	In-school	64/80	76.2	Extension
G	339,568	1	AS	108/102	105.9	Extension
H	665,796	2	AS	100/87	114.9	Extension
I	381,042	1	PSS	77/79	9.75	New
J	rural	9	1 PSS & 5 In-school	64/56	114.3	New
K	rural	1	In-school	45/57	78.9	New
L	8,000,000$^+$	2	PSS & LEA	50/50	100.0	Extension

[a] Source: County and City Data Book 1977: A statistic abstract supplement, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census 1978.

[b] Consolidated city--county population figures.

[c] PNP = Public nonprofit program
AS = alternative school
PSS = post-secondary school

[d] Source: Blackstone Institute MIS reports, 12/16/80.

[e] New programs are defined as programs created by Youthwork, Inc. and programs defined as extensions are programs which evolved from previous funding sources.

Trained participant observers, located at nine of the eleven projects provided three forms of data for this report. The first method used by the participant observers was documentation of their program's operations and interactions based on a focused analysis packet (see the Methodological Chapter of this report). Over five hundred pages of focused on-site observation data were generated in the form of protocols by means of this method. This information was cross-validated through a comparative analysis of several thousand pages of protocol data provided by the on-site observers at ten of these projects during fiscal year 1979. The second data collection methodology used by on-site observers was unstructured questionnaires administered at seven of the eleven projects. The questionnaires were constructed by the on-site observers and followed the outline of the analysis packet "Program Organization". The third method employed by seven of the on-site observers was narrative summaries of observers perceptions of the characteristics of their project's program organization. This third data methodology was especially useful as a means of triangulation of findings, as it provided a means to cross-validate the researchers conclusions from the protocol data by comparison with the on-site observers impressions. Table 2 below summarizes the types of data used for convergent validation.

In addition to these data collection methodologies, quantitative data provided by Youthwork, Inc. on the Academic Credit projects were integrated into the analysis where applicable.

Excepting the two projects which did not have on-site observers in the Fall 1979, all but two of the nine Academic Credit projects

TABLE 2

DATA COLLECTION ACTIVITIES BY PROGRAMMATIC

MODELS OF THE ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR WORK EXPERIENCE PROJECTS

	Program Organization Data Collection Methodology			
Programmatic Project Model	Focused Protocol Data	Questionnaires	On-site Observer Project Summaries	FY'79 Protocol Data
In-School	3	2	3	5
Alternative School	3	2	2	3
Public Nonprofit	0	0	0	0
Post-Secondary	2	2	2	2
TOTAL	8	6	7	10

employed at least two of the data collection methodologies outlined above. One of the projects where the on-site observer did not use at least two data collection methodologies was included in the following Findings section as convergent validation of finding was available though fiscal year 1979 protocol data. Therefore, eight projects are included in the analysis of this chapter. Table 3 summarizes the total sample size and reasons for exclusion from the following Findings section.

TABLE 3

STATUS OF ON-SITE OBSERVERS AND REPORTING

AT THE ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR WORK EXPERIENCE PROJECTS

Programmatic Project Model	No Observer Present	Incomplete Data	Observers Data Used in Chapter	Total # of Projects
In-School	1	1	3	5
Alternative School	0	0	3	3
Public Non-Profit	1	0	0	1
Post-secondary	0	0	2	2
TOTAL	2	1	8	11

FINDINGS

Introduction

The Academic Credit for Work Experience Projects were designed to grant academic credit to youth for competencies acquired through career development classes, job exploration and job placement. Under the YEDPA legislation of 1977:

> The Congress fully intended that arrangements be made with the state and local education officials so that academic credit would be given for the skills and knowledge acquired through work experience that would deserve credit if earned through traditional schooling or in other ways. (DOL, ETA, OYP 1977:1).

For youth participating in the YETP academic credit projects to receive credit for their program participation, both the LEA and

CETA must work together to develop credit arrangements. Within state-legislated minimum required courses of study, LEAs have primary responsibility for determining the amount and type of credit received by secondary students in their district.

> Predominantly in American schools, the local school board is the only agency authorized by legislative action to develop local policy governing the award of credit. Learning which takes place under the sponsorship of that local district, whether it is mandated by state or locally developed curricula, whether it is 'in the schools' or elsewhere, can be legitimately recognized by the districts through the award of credits.
>
> There appears to be a great deal of local autonomy in the granting of credits. Building principals may have discretionary power over the awarding of credit. School districts can create courses of study and determine how many credits each is worth. (National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1979:14,15)

Negotiating with the LEA or post-secondary institution for accreditation of learning or skills acquired by youth, the Youthwork Academic Credit projects have designed several means to ascertain the level and type of achievement of their participants. Contingent on the credit arrangements made with the LEA or post-secondary institution, the projects "measure" youth performance or learning through the use of learning contracts or competency tests. Learning contracts are individualized and are designed by either project teaching staff alone or with input from LEA teachers or guidance counselors. The contracts are designed to designate what learning objectives will be pursued and how the individual will be assessed on knowledge or skills acquired in the classroom or work site. Competency tests can be part of this process, or indirectly related by means of acquiring credits through passage of LEA, state or post-secondary standardized competency tests.

The following two sections examine how academic credit arrangements are determined and how competency levels and learning contracts have been developed over the past year. Throughout this chapter, the ramifications of program organization on competency criteria and academic credit are discussed.

I. The Determination of Academic Credit: Organization

Whether academic credit is granted, what type and how much credit is awarded to YETP academic credit program participants is determined by three different organizations: the LEA, state, or post-secondary institution. Depending on the population served and project location, the academic credit for work experience project staff negotiated with these organizations to determine the award of academic credit to participants. Table 4 below summarizes the relationship in the granting of credit between the eight projects and the accredidation institutions. The credit negotiation process between the projects and the education institution varies contingent upon which education organization has authority over the recognition of academic credit.

The state has discretionary power over the granting of academic credits at two of the alternative schools and is involved in setting minimum competency levels for graduation at one in-school project. The accredidation process at the two alternative schools took place before the inception of this study, and hence cannot be documented here. Aside from annual curriculum and program checks, the state appears to

TABLE 4

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAMMATIC MODEL AND EDUCATION ORGANIZATION IN THE GRANTING OF ACADEMIC CREDIT

	Education Organization		
Programmatic Project Model	State	LEA	Post-Secondary Institution
In-School	0	3	0
Alternative School	2	1	0
Post-Secondary	0	0	2
TOTAL	2	4	2

have allowed these two projects to decide for themselves the design of courses, curriculum and competencies (within state mandated course minimums). The states allow more autonomy and local project authority in credit arrangements to the alternative schools than do the LEAs to their affiliated youthwork programs. The most stringent requirements are set by post-secondary institutions.

The LEA is involved in deciding curriculum, courses, and competencies at four of the studied academic credit projects (three in-school and one alternative school). Determination of credit arrangements between project staff and the LEA occurs on an individual-by-individual student basis at three of the four projects. At the LEA affiliated alternative school, whose participants come to the program from a number of different public schools, the credit process is described by the on-site observer as follows:

> Academic credit is granted in subject areas defined by the public school in which the student is formally enrolled. English, Math, Social Studies and Physical Education are common to all local public schools. Other subjects may differ from school to school. Credits are granted in accordance with the policy of the individual school...In other words, all granting of credit must be handled on a school by school basis.

Two in-school projects negotiate with the LEA on a similar basis, where participants credit arrangements are made through interactions with the public school (LEA) teachers or guidance counselors and project teachers. This is particularly the case for state minimum courses of study (i.e. basic skills), as opposed to electives. A learning coordinator at one in-school project said:

> For some academic courses where the students are to get YETP credit, I have gone to the regular high school teachers of the courses and found out what teachers expect of their students and what activities occur in regular classes. If I feel the YETP student cannot meet the regular course objectives, then I modify the course and call it independent study.

Academic credit and course work is predetermined by the LEA curriculum for the project participants in the area of basic skills. Project teachers work with LEA teachers to assure that participants meet the LEA course and competency criteria. This negotiation process occurs when project academic credit plans for a youth are being designed between the LEA teacher or counselor and the project staff. Once a youth becomes a program participant, the LEA is no longer involved in the participants project educational experiences. The LEA does not actively monitor the "quality" of the youth's education services or academic credits at these two in-school projects.

The final in-school project is organized differently than the other two in-school projects. Instead of reporting directly to the

LEA, they have been integrated into a special education program at the school site and negotiate with that program. Indirectly they are involved with the LEA as their teaching staff are teachers from the school system assigned to the Youthwork program. Credits and courses are determined by the other alternative program at the school, although essentially the credit coursework is the same as the site's public school curriculum. The on-site observer explains:

> Up until now the public school's department heads have not been involved with the YETP program because the school's alternative program has made the decisions as far as what was taught without input from the department heads. Most of the teachers in the YETP project were assigned to it from the public schools because they were lowest in seniority, not because they were ideologically committed...the teachers run their classes as they please. The YETP program is a lot of extra work for them as they are supposed to make sure students do not work in class on competencies they are assigned to learn on the job. The teachers ignore this and do not treat the YETP student's curriculum any differently than the regular alternative education program student's curriculum.

In this instance, the public school alternative program is responsible for monitoring the academic credit arrangements for participants although they have allowed more autonomy in the initial choice of competency levels than the other two in-school projects. In part this may be because the project teachers are from the school system and know the traditional curriculum well enough to match learning contracts and competencies with the public school's measures of subject mastery.

The post-secondary affiliated projects are similar to the LEA affiliated projects in the determination of credit for Youthwork participants. Credit is awarded to Youthwork participants at the two post-secondary projects when they meet the standards outlined in the institution's core curriculum. Independent study courses do not have to meet such rigid competency requirements. A post-secondary observer explains:

> The post-secondary insitution would not approve the awarding of credit for direct work experience, so through curriculum design the project staff attempted to circumvent this problem. None of the academic credit is granted in lieu of taking a traditional curriculum course. The complete course of study includes basic courses and program courses, much like a traditional college program with a major subject.

The two post-secondary projects differ in the process of obtaining credit for Youthwork participants. At one project the students enroll in the institutions regular courses, and at the other project the project teaching staff teach the class material themselves from the post-secondary course syllabus. Both projects rely on tutoring of participants in core curriculum, with credit determination negotiated between project and the post-secondary teaching staff. The post-secondary administration decides the basic guidelines, such as whether participants get credit for work experience, and rely on their teaching staff to negotiate with the project staff and individual participants on the acquisition of academic credits. Regarding credit arrangements, the post-secondary institution is the least flexible of the project affiliated education institutions in granting academic credit for work experience for competencies derived from the work experience.

Where projects have to negotiate with several different schools (which includes three projects) problems emerge. Aside from being time consuming and limiting in the types of credit awarded and for what type of mastery, there is confusion over how much credit can be awarded. An LEA affilitated project observer discusses some of the problems of granting credit to Youthwork participants:

> The awarding of credit varies from one school system to another. One school may say, 'Because we assume the students will learn English in school and at work we will give them full credit for English'. Another school in the same situation may say, 'We will give the student half a credit for work and half a credit for English'. Each school determines its own requirements for distribution of credits. Each school can make whatever it wants into an academic credit.

There is evidence from the observation data that the process for determining academic credit is changing. This is particularly the case for those projects affiliated with an LEA or post-secondary institution. Originally, these projects (three in-school and two post-secondary) were stymied by the education authorities in the granting of credit to Youthwork participants.[1] Over the past year, negotiations have lead to greater acceptance of the projects. One post-secondary Youthwork project teacher said:

> I think what is going on is that we have had some successes with the students. The faculty sent us some students they thought were real losers and they are turning out well. They are getting jobs now. I think that helps alot.

The process of institutionalization of the academic credit projects and their evolving relationships with the LEAs will be examined in a forthcoming report. At present, the relationships are having clear ramifications for the functioning of the projects, especially in regard to credit arrangements for the student participants.

---

[1] See Youthwork National Policy Study Interim Report #1, 1979:74-80 for start-up problems of projects and the lack of commitment by LEA's to the Youthwork academic credit projects in awarding both basic skills credit and work experience competency based credit.

II. The Determination of Academic Credit: Competencies

Seven of the eight observed academic credit for work experience projects were granting academic credit to participants during the Fall 1979 school term. Credit was awarded to participants for both elective or work-study and basic skills (core curriculum) coursework. The one project which was not granting credit was unable to do so because of problems in developing learning contracts and measuring competencies.

This project exemplified a process that six of the eight studied projects were undergoing. As the projects entered their second year of operation, they began to develop new procedures or refine old ones so as to determine measurement of competencies or acquired knowledge skills. Why projects are trying new methods is discussed by the observer at an alternative school:

> The program coordinator feels that they are getting closer to a working system of awarding academic credit by trying new ideas to see if they work. She felt that they would develop a theory later. No one seems to know exactly how to do it.

In the effort to develop new procedures so as to enhance program services, one project rendered itself incapable of granting credits. As was explained by the on-site observer:

> This fall they decided to pretest students on their curricula for the entire school year, not just for the competencies the student might acquire at the worksite. Pretesting began in October 1979 for Math and English subjects, and it took the students 2-3 weeks to complete these tests. For the Social Studies component, most students took 5-6 weeks to complete the pretest. The Xeroxing of these pretests alone cost $500. The tests are still not marked as of mid-December, as the two

> aides who were supposed to mark the tests quit. It took one aide, before she left, one full day to mark the Math tests for one student. Hopefully, contracts will be established for the students once the tests are marked.

Five of the other projects are also working on their learning contracts or means of determining credit, although they have not become paralyzed by this process. One in-school project has not changed its credit procedures as the project staff are satisfied with the process which was developed last year. The other project which has not changed is a post-secondary project which has its course competency levels set by the faculty. In this case the educational institutions defined competency levels so the project did not need to try innovative approaches. Otherwise, six projects (including the stalemated project) have devised new or refined competency determinations and learning contracts.

The ways these projects are changing their measurement of competencies and expectation of participants differ. Thus far, employers have not been observed to be routinely involved in ascertaining youth's competencies at any of the eight projects. Employers are asked to report on attendance and general attitude of the participants, which is factored by project teachers into the youth's course grade or award of credits. Competencies and receipt of credit, for the most part, are determined by passage of written tests, turning in products and for all but three projects, attendance records.

Involvement of work site supervisors in ascertaining competencies is one means of relating the work experience learning and skill attainment into the youth curriculum and academic coursework. Two post-secondary projects and one alternative school have begun to involve work site supervisors in the measurement of youth competencies and teaching of youth skills.[2] The observer at the alternative school reports:

> Right now they are attempting to involve more employers in the awarding of credit through a reading and writing workshop that is planned for the near future. The program is going to insist that all employers attend this workshop and try to pressure them to become involved in integrating teaching skills on the job.

Seeking input from supervisors is in response to problems encountered at the work site where students were not properly supervised. Without proper supervision youth participants were not able to integrate the skills gained through work experience with their academic and educational needs. At an alternative school:

> Some of the employers have not been able to provide the close supervision some of the students need. The director hopes to be working with employers to help them develop techniques for supervision that require minimal time, yet provide the students with the attention and directions that they need to have.

One post-secondary project beginning to involve the employer more in the process of evaluating and teaching youth participants at the job site has encountered problems in doing so. The change in procedure was requested by the prime sponsor and entailed having work site supervisors sign a paper acknowledging their responsibilities to the youths. This has not proved to be successful in integrating the work experience into the youth's competencies plans or in making supervisors more responsive to youth's skill and knowledge needs. This procedure has been documented to frighten potential supervisors from employing youth at their work sites. One teacher at this project said employers responded to signing the document and paperwork by saying:

---

[2] This is beginning to occur at one other in-school project, but has not been as active a process. The other projects do not involve the employer in the competency criteria and objectives, although the project staffs do integrate work experience gained skills and knowledge into the contract or competency criteria.

> "I will be happy to take the kids, but I am not going to fill out any papers." The teacher then commented, "So what am I going to do?"

Not only are employers hesitant to become involved in this documentaiton process, the teachers at this post-secondary project themselves have not been committed to this mandated procedure. They have had to respond to faculty pressure in designing their curriculum and have had to conform to the institution's competency determinations. As one teacher explained:

> We have to make sure the school system's objectives are met first. I have to see, for example, that a student covers all units of a sociology syllabus first.

This project has been thwarted in its efforts to develop work experience related competencies because of this lack of curriculum autonomy, and also because they have been unable to define the objectives of the post-secondary curricula. When asked why they have been unable to develop objectives and measures of attainment in their learning contracts, one teacher responded:

> My problem with the college faculty is that they know nothing about education. I think if you asked them for the objectives of their courses they would say "each student has to write a paper". Academicians are concerned with memorizing facts, not real learning. They want students to memorize facts; not learn the basic sociological principles.

The other three projects (one in-school and two alternative schools) are refining their competency/learning contracts in several ways. The in-school project is in the process of making several changes: 1) increasing amount of credit possible to obtain, 2) streamlining competency related paperwork, and 3) focusing more on the intent of the coursework and less on the course (specific) objectives. One of the alternative schools is trying to individualize competency criteria for coursework and more thoroughly analyzing each youth participants economic and social backgrounds. The other alternative school is in the process of discerning participants educational and course needs as a means to assure participants meet graduation credit requirements. This process is beginning to entail a pre- and post-test of participant's competency levels in Math, English, Social Studies, and Science.

III. Program Administration

> Central to the functioning of every organization is the administrative process. No organization can afford to be without administrative talent, ideas and technologies, for their absence places an organization's resources in jeopardy and minimizes the effective and creative use of those resources. (Mackenzie, 1969 in Demone, *et al.*, 1973:233)

The administrative structure of an organization operates to define, regulate and sanction interorganizational behavior. In human service organizations, there are primarily two means of structuring the organization; bureaucracies and the professional norms of staff. Both operate, but in quite different ways, to define interorganizational behavior and operation. These factors essentially operate to maintain social regulation of the organization in an inverse fashion:

> In organization's effort to maintain some level of interorganizational reality and/or social control, an organization will rely on professional norms and standards if possible. If this is not possible, then hierarchial, bureaucratized systems will emerge. The greater the degree of professionalism the less the bureaucratic hierarchy; conversely, the less the degree of professionalism, the greater the degree of bureaucratization. (Hall, 1967 in Demone, et al., 1973:165)

The resultant administrative structure of the organization is somewhere on the continuum of a bureaucratic hierarchy to a participatory democracy, where a participating democracy is the result of relying on professional norms, decision-making and follow-through as the means of administration. Whichever administrative structure characterizes the organization, the administrative functions of the structure remain the same: data input, monitoring, problem conceptualizing, problem analysis, organizational decisions, action, purposeful follow-through, feedback, generating organizational change, human relations, and communication. For the organization to operate without strain, all these functions must be performed by someone necessarily affiliated with the organization. The bureaucratic hierarchy is predicated on a hierarchy of authority and a system of rules. Specialized functions of both administrative structures, such as decision-making procedures, can be the same process in both structures. The difference between the structures is whether the procedure is systematized and governed by a clear set of rules, responsibilities and roles. Participatory democracies are characterized by consensual administration where there is no clear delegation of authority or clear, delineated staff responsibilities. An autocratic administration involves a sole administrator who does not delegate programmatic power and authority to project staff.

The Academic Credit for Work Experience projects have created and utilized both of the administrative structures described above: bureaucracies and participatory democracies. A variant of a bureaucracy, autocratic administration, was developed at one project.

The Academic Credit for Work Experience programs are administratively characterized by three different structures as noted in Table 5.

TABLE 5

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE ACADEMIC FOR WORK EXPERIENCE PROJECTS

	Bureaucratic Hierarchy	Participatory Democracy	Autocratic
In-School Projects	3	0	0
Alternative Schools	1	2	0
Post-Secondary Projects	1	0	1
TOTAL	5	2	1

It is extremely important to note though, that the administrative structures of the projects have evolved over time, and are still in the process of changing. Also of importance is that what characterizes and differentiates bureaucracies from participatory democracies is primarily the staff role differentiation in terms of routinized tasks and responsibilities.

Alternative Schools. During the first year of operation, two of the three alternative schools were administratively operated under a participatory democracy. Although ultimately the directors of these schools were accountable for each of the programs, the administrative functions of the schools were decentralized and delegation of responsibilities was not hierarchial. Of the administrative tasks necessary to be performed for the organization to function, only data monitoring was specialized and performed by one specific person. At one school, this taks, considered onerous (see YNPS Interim Report #1, 1979:66) was shifted to different staff members thoughout the year as it became too burdensome or cumbersome. The other administrative tasks, such as problem analysis, generating change, and communication involved a process of reaching a consensus of participants and invested interest staff members.

Two of the alternative schools are now in the process of changing their administrative structure from participatory to bureaucratic. At one school there has been a resistance to this change by the director and other staff members who have been with the organization for several years. At a staff meeting at this school, the on-site observer comments:

> All this emphasis on role development is in contrast to what I have heard in the past from the same people who are supporting these ideas. In the past they felt the school was getting too structured and was loosing some of the quality that made it an alternative high school.

The change in administrative structure underway in the schools is in response to pressures for accountability. Without rules and lines of authority, services delivery staff and on-line program administrators had been unable to coordinate their services or provide comprehensive services to participants. One school which has consequently become bureaucratized perceived the need to obtain service accountability through coordination of curriculum and hence hired a program coordinator. This alleviated at least one of their service delivery problems. As one staff member said:

> Having Jane here also is good.[3] She has definitely organized a lot of things. It is important too; students were asking how many credits they had and they should know that. She takes the pressure off us this year

Operating under staff shortages and with time constraints, services delivery staff, such as teachers, did not have the time, nor the clear authority to coordinate their curriculum with other teachers. As illustrated in the case below, they were unaware of the student's academic credit situation and needs beyond their individual classroom. One of the alternative school's staff commented:

> Terri thinks she will be graduating in January. One of the things the new learning coordinator is doing now is reviewing every student's credits. Some students do not have the points they thought they had...It will be interesting to see what Terri's attitude will be if it turns out she cannot graduate in January.

In response to this lack of coordination, two of the alternative schools have, or are in the process of formalizing delegation of responsibility. One on-site observer relates:

> The program administration has been tightened up considerably in the area of supervision of teachers. Last year, because of absences and consequent lack of personnel, the program director and the head of the Education Department were complaining mightily on having to guess on whether to renew teacher's contracts. It appears that the program director is spending much more time in the supervisory role with teachers. He does this in a formal structure rather than an informal structure, and it is perhaps due to his formal style that the grumbling about hierarchial decision-making is being triggered.

---

[3] Throughout this entire report, names of project personnel and participants have been changed to protect the identity of the individuals.

From an administrative perspective, one way to achieve accountability is to become more hierarchial. One program administrator stated:

> There is no decision-making structure, it does not exist. One of the things the director and I are working on now is how decisions are made. Now they are made with some form of consensus. I would like to see some changes in the way decisions are made if I am to be held accountable for what goes on here.

There is resistance by program staff to becoming bureaucratized, despite the perceived need for it, for several reasons. The alternative schools feel that by becoming bureaucratized, they are replicating the traditional school environment. The consequences of a hierarchial structure in traditional schools, from their perception, is the reason in part why these schools have failed in meeting their students' needs. As an administrative structure, bureaucracies have the potential to inhibit innovation. In a bureaucracy:

> Over time the tasks people perform and the ways in which they relate to each other become sufficiently routinized to allow necessary levels of predictability in everyday organizational life. Imbedded in these developmental processes are both the elements that are required for long term organizational stability, goal setting, and growth, as well as the potential for excessive routinization, bureaucratic red tape, boredom and organizational dry rot. (Gardner *et al*., 1965 in Demone *et al*., 1973:163)

These latter occurrances are probably what the alternative school staff equate with bureaucracies.

Another reason why alternative school programs do not want to change their administrative structure is because some of the service delivery staff feel that a bureaucratic structure would preclude their having impact on program decisions and changes. As a participatory democracy, administrative functions are carried out through a decentralized process of staff taking responsibility for and initiative on decisions and actions. It is reliant on individual professionals as the means of administration. Fearing the loss of professional autonomy, the one alternative school which has moved some distance towards creating a bureaucratic administrative structure is encountering problems with several staff members. As the director explains:

> The staff (teachers and counselors) say they have no involvement in decision-making. I say they have a lot. We discuss everything in groups. With the particular group of people we have on staff I find they prefer to turn the decision over to me and the other administrator. We do not impose a schedule on them, they can write their own schedule if they want. But instead, after making clear what they want, they ask us to do it for them. They do not want to be bothered with the details of making up a schedule and I do not blame them. We do go back after we have done it and say; 'Is this what you wanted?'

As this program has recently evolved its structure into one more bureaucratic, it is yet too soon to know what the long term reaction of the staff will be. At this project, and at the alternative school which is still participatory, but steadily changing, the on-site observer elucidates what may be occurring:

> There is much lip service paid to hierarchial decision-making, and, in fact, this style of decision making has been emphasized more this program year than in previous years. There is much grumbling from some staff, particularly teachers, about autocratic decision-making. It is in this observer's opinion, however, that the decision making is not hierarchial. In fact, staff members have input into the kinds of decisions that are made, but there are no formal channels for this to happen. Therefore, many staff members do not perceive that their strongly held opinions are having impact upon the shape of the ultimate decisions because they are not present when the decisions are made.

It is not that on-line staff do not have input into decisions, but that they do not see the immediate outcomes of their input. The issue, then is less one of administrative structure than the fact that certain functions of the structure are not being implemented. In this instance, there is no formalized means for input (it is not a bureaucracy) and more importantly, there is no tangible feedback to staff on their input. If the newly (evolving) bureaucratized alternative school administrators could provide feedback to staff on the outcomes of staff input, staff discontentment may be rectified.

Another factor which has hindered effective and efficient administration of two of the alernative schools is that responsible staff have been concerned with educational rather than administrative tasks. Human service organizations typically promote and appoint administrators based on their academic training and interests rather than on administrative or managerial interests. (Demone _et al_., 1973:233) Such people are not always the most knowledgeable or effective administrators. At two of the alternative schools the operators would rather practice their profession (education) and work with the students instead of concentrating on program administration. One director said:

> The more time I can spend with the kids the better everyone will feel. The problem has been having a director who wants to be more in the role of a teacher, but recognizes the need to take administrative tasks off the teachers. I am looking forward to finding a new school site where we can have two offices so that I can move down to the school site full-time. I will be more distracted there, but I will be happier.

As two of the alternative school directors would rather be working with the students, they tend to ignore or procrastinate on administrative chores, or to delegate the responsibility to other staff members. By delegating administrative tasks to staff members at different times, confusion is created and accountability becomes nigh unto impossible.

At the third alternative school, a bureaucratic hierarchy has been administratively operative since at least October 1978. Staff roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and the administrative functions of problem analysis, communication, and problem resolution are operational. What have specifically helped the administration of this alternative school are on-site teacher supervision and coordination of curriculum. The whole probject staff attends weekly staff meeting with a structured agenda often centered on problem analysis and implementation of decisions. Administrative responsibility for the project is assumed by the director, which is the director's sole responsibility. There is no conflict of roles and responsibilities at this project (in contrast to the other two schools) because the director has delegated responsibility and follow-through on decisions. At one staff meeting, the on-site observer described an interaction as follows:

> The director tells the staff (s)he wants a written account of what they are doing in their classrooms, what they feel they should be doing, and what their limitations are. (S)He asks them to have this report in by the next Monday, and promises to schedule a personal conference with them to discuss this report in the near future.

Within this administrative structure, staff are able to work together on consensual problem-solving and maintain good inter-staff relationships. At another staff meeting, the on-site observer gives his/her opinion of the meeting as follows:

> From this staff meeting, I see that the individual members of the staff, although sometimes disagreeing on how to approach problems, seem to be able to work together in a cooperative manner to meet the needs of their students.

At all three alternative schools, staff interactions and administrative functions focus primarily on student needs. In this context the staffs work together and program administration is modified and changed to meet the participants programmatic needs. Relating a discussion with one of the alternative school coordinators, the observer writes:

> The staff tries to remain sensitive at all times to the needs of the students. The basic assumption in many discussions at staff meetings and more informally through everyday activities is that there is not one answer for all students. What works best for one particular student may not be best for another.

The observer comments at another time after attending a staff meeting:

> I see that the individual members of the staff, although sometimes disagreeing on how to approach problems, seem to be able to work together in a cooperative manner to meet the needs of the students.

In-School Projects. All three of the in-school projects are bureaucratically administered, although the reasons and results of this structure are different for one than for the other two in-school projects.

Two of the projects are responsible for less client services than the alternative schools, and hence these in-school programs have been inter-organizationally easier to administer. Roles and responsibilities of staff are clearly defined at these two projects. An on-site observer summarized the administrative structure of the projects as follows:

> Everyone really takes care of administrative responsibilities for their own area. The project director handles administration as it relates to the outside bureaucracies; such as CETA, DOL, Youthwork, Blackstone etc. The teacher, for example, must check up for absences from the class, and bring the student up for disciplinary action if he/she misses two classes.

> He is responsible for equipment and materials in the classroom. The home-school liaison is responsible for intake forms and income verification of participants. She also picks up time sheets every two weeks from employers. The job development counselor must keep in touch with employers, must develop new job sites and must arrange to get students interviews with potential employers. The secretary handles clerical and secretarial duties.

Unlike the alternative school projects, two of the in-school projects are responsible for only a segment of the students educational needs. Exceptions to this are youth who only need a few credits to graduate and take them only through the Youthwork programs. Otherwise, at two projects students in the in-school projects typically takes classes in the regular school curriculum in addition to their Youthwork project classes. The school system is thus part of the administration of in-school projects. Curriculum design, courses and credits are arranged by the projects in conjunction with the school system. The result was that the in-school projects were administratively bureaucratic.

One in-school project is an exception to the consequences of administrative interaction between in-school projects and the LEA. This third in-school program is operated separately from its affiliated public shool curriculum and administration. Its youth participants take all their coursework through the project and, while located within the public school, do not interact with the public school personnel. The project is subsumed under another alternative education program at the school which in turn acts as a liaison with the LEA. The Youthwork project is bureaucratic in administrative structure, but lacks an active centralized administrator. The on-site observer compares the administrative structure to a "feudal system with each of the components working separately of each other, yet all paying taxes to a common master" (the alternate program). The result is similar to the alternative schools which are participatory democratic in administrative structure, and where there is a similar lack of coordination of services. It is not a participatory democracy as there are rules and regulations for what each staff member should be doing. The problem is that there is no supervision of what each staff person is doing. Teachers are not following the project agenda or curriculum designs. Potential programmatic changes are not being made.

Inter-organizationally, the decision-making process at the other two in-school projects has been (like the alternative schools) based on a consensus. Because of small staff size, and unlike the alternative schools, the consensual decision-making process usually involved only two or three staff members. Typically, the director and staff person(s) meet informally for problem analysis and program decisions. These two in-school projects have had between one and four teachers for their programs. With these smaller teaching staff sizes and less responsibility for the total education needs of participants, these two in-school projects have not sought tight teacher supervision.

This is in contraxt to two of the alternative schools which have had to strengthen the supervision of teachers and coordination of curriculum. At one school, a person was recently hired specifically with this as their primary responsibility. Administratively, this resulted in relieved strain in the area of service deliery and accountability.[4] Also impacting on the administrative difference between alternative schools and in-school projects is that the choices of curriculum and courses at the in-school projects are not as flexible or extensive as those in the alternative schools. With the LEA monitoring mandated services,[5] the in-school projects have not had the autonomy to make as many, nor as complicated, decisions as the alternative school projects.

---

[4] See p. 3.22 of this report for discussion of one alternative school hiring a learning coordinator to coordinate curriculums and discern the credit needs of participants.

Post-Secondary Projects. One of the post-secondary projects has evolved into a bureaucracy, whereas the other post-secondary project has remained administratively autocratic. Initially, the former project lacked any administrative structure, but since start-up problems no longer plague the project (See YNPS Interim Report #1, 1979:69) it has gradually delineated the roles and responsibilities of its staff members. As their on-site observer explains:

> Now that there is a full complement of students, and after three academic quarters of operation, the project is finally becoming viable. The staff is informed and the lines of authority and responsibility are clear. The atmosphere is one of a working project, rather than the earlier atmosphere of a group of people struggling to pull things together.

The administrative structure of other post-secondary project is difficult to delineate. It is bureaucratic in that roles have been defined for the staff, but many administrative functions are not carried out because there is no delegation of responsibility. Consisting of a small, overworked staff, the project has experienced many operational problems. It has been labeled here as administratively autocratic, given that the director retains control over staff activities and limits their responsibilities so as to restrict their delivery of services. Foremost, the project has lacked a means by which to undertake problem conceptualizing and analysis in order to modify, change or expand the program. In the area of academic credit for work experience, for example, it is imperative that these functions exist and be operational as there are no "cookbooks" on how to design and implement competencies or learning contracts. The issues and approaches evolve. The program must be able to do the same.

---

[5] In the case of one in-school project, the LEA's Alternative Program was monitoring the Youthwork program rather than that of the LEA's own administrative structure.

Conceptually, the granting of academic credit for work experience has not and perhaps cannot be fully articulated. At six of the academic credit for work experience projects, there has been continual change and modification of their services in terms of competencies, learning contracts and coursework. But at one of the post-secondary projects this is not occurring. The teachers responsible for developing the academic credit for work experience curricula have not had the authority to make any major changes or innovations. They are responsible for following the LEA or post-secondary institutions curricula and hence are not able to deviate from the imposed structure. Reporting a conversation with two staff members, the on-site observer writes:

> The teachers explain that students are not actually receiving credit for competencies. The college faculty expect the teachers to follow their class syllabus with the student during in-house time and then the teacher tries to relate the material to the student's job as much as possible.

There have been some programmatic changes in this project, but they have been instituted by the prime sponsor or outside technical assistant. The project modifications by the prime sponsor have either added extra work or lost potential job sites. The problems the on-line staff had with the documents for the job supervisor were not conveyed to the prime sponsor, and as such the problems have not been remedied.

At this project, the director has retained full control of outside contacts, and does not work as a liaison to convey programmatic problems, nor does s/he present a forum for his/her staff administratively work on problem conceptualization and solution. At a staff meeting where the discussions has turned to refunding, the on-site observer relates.

> The various staff members talk about how much they have learned in the past year and how much they now know about what is possible and what they need. Yet I continually see the director discouraging this level of conversation as he again changes the subject. I think s/he is taking much more a status quo approach to refunding. My feelings are that s/he does really care about running a program that benefits students, but that s/he has little concern for programmatic innovation. I sense that s/he cares that students have good jobs and get their money, but that the academic struggles of the program are a lower priority. I also sense that s/he thinks it his/her right as director to make these judgements and is not particularly interested in the staff discussing these issues.

The effect of this administration authority structure is that staff cannot discuss programmatic problems or provide input to influence programmatic changes. Staff at this post-secondary project, however, do enjoy noninterference in their interactions with the students and daily program planning. They experience frustration over their inability to impact on program changes. This in turn, overrides their satisfaction with flexibility. During a discussion of administrative styles, one teacher says:

> It is very relaxed atmosphere and the working conditions are good. Nobody could ask for a better situation. The director encourages us to make our own decisions. There is a great deal of freedom. Sometimes too much, I think. If I go in with a real problem, I know what s/he will say, "what do you think?"...Sometimes I feel that we are not accomplishing all that could be accomplished.
>
> Observer continues--She talks about the morning's staff meeting and a discussion of common goals and objectives for the next year. "It is just not like that here. We do not talk about that here."

The other post-secondary school has also demonstrated how bureaucratic administrative structures can be impeded when all necessary tasks of the administration are not performed. As the director said:

> Initially, the project, student and staff alike, suffered from a lack of clearly defined roles for staff. This affected the students and communication between students and staff. Now roles are defined, but there is still a communication problem among staff members, especially the counseling unit. Too often, they expect me to take on communication facilitator role. I have neither the time nor the energy for it and I cannot from my position anyway. So, I see that at first the structure of the organization prevented communication. Now the structure is okay; it is individual failures now.

Both of the post-secondary projects are similar to the in-school projects in that the LEA is involved in the design and delivery of services to the participants. The necessary interaction between the LEA and the projects over course offerings, curriculum, and academic credit and the projects interaction with CETA and Youthwork, Inc. suggests why a hierarchial bureaucratic or autocratic structure has been created at these projects. These projects are responsible to a number of different bureaucratic organizations. The administrative structure can be most accountable to other organizations through a centralized and delineated authority structure.

IV. Program Retention

As the Academic Credit for Work Experience Projects enter their second year of operation, it is informative to examine which participants have chosen to leave or have been terminated by the various projects. Through examining why participants have left the projects, one can infer for whom the projects are most beneficial. One can also infer which participants are not being served by the projects.

Overall, from October 1978 to October 1979, 241 of 752 or 32%[6] of the participants in the eight examined Academic Credit for Work Experience Programs were terminated. This figure reflects both participants who chose to leave projects for their own reasons, and participants who were dropped by the project administration.

Analysis of the participant's characteristics who left the projects presented some interesting findings. Across the eight Academic Credit for Work Experience Programs, roughly equal numbers of males and females terminated (29.8% and 34.1% respectively).[7] The reasons why the participants are no longer enrolled in the projects do vary by sex of the participant. Other factors which influence retention rates are social status and age of the participant.

Age of Participant. The older the participant, the more likely he or she will terminate or be terminated from an academic credit for work experience project. Several intervening variables are responsible in part for this occurrance. The older the participant becomes, the more likely he or she will have been labelled an offender, become a school dropout, become financially independent, or for a female, become pregnant. These groups are high "at risk" for project termination. Another factor related the older youth's higher dropout rate is the compulsory education ends when the youth reaches 16 years old. Interestingly, the high termination trend in older participants holds true for the six alternative schools and in-school projects, but reverses itself in the post-secondary projects. These latter two projects have no classified school dropouts and only a few (3) classified offenders. In general, they serve different target population.[8] Table 6 summarizes the relationship between project strategy, age of participant and enrollment status.

---

[6] MIS Data Bank, Participant Program Summary, 12/16/79, Youthwork, Inc.

[7] Ibid.

At both the alternative school and in-school projects the 18-19 year old populations had termination rates higher than their younger participant counterparts. The MIS data, although substantiated by protocol data, must be interpreted with caution. It appears the data are inflated with participants who have left before or during orientation. Protocol data from one in-school project cautions on the use of the MIS data:

> According to staff, of the females who leave the program for other than the fact they are moving away from the school district, they leave because they are pregnant. This is true for both black and white females. Of the males who leave, the majority of those left because they never really got involved in the first place. While the intake was completed and they were therefore officially enrolled, something made them decide to not pursue the program. So in a sense they never really gave the program a chance. Some students have left because they really needed a full-time job. They were emancipated and must support themselves. The half-time job this project offers them really is not enough money for them. Only two students in the program dropped out of school; one went to jail.

---

[8] See YNPS Interim Report #2, 1979:46-47,61. The post-secondary students joined the Youthwork programs to receive an education or credentials which is in contrast to the other programmatic project model participants who joined primarily to receive pay.

TABLE 6

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS AND ENROLLMENT STATUS IN EIGHT SELECTED ACADEMIC CREDIT PROJECTS

Project Strategy and Age of Participant	Operative Year 10/1/78-9/30/79 Enrolled	Terminated	% Terminated
Alternative Schools			
14-15 yrs	73	16	21.92
16-17 yrs	170	44	25.88
18-19 yrs	34	14	41.18
20+ yrs	1	0	0
Subtotal:	278	74	
In-School Projects			
14-15 yrs	24	10	41.67
16-17 yrs	244	88	36.07
18-19 yrs	61	39	63.93
20+ yrs	4	3	75.0
Subtotal:	333	140	
Post-secondary Projects			
14-15 yrs*	12	6	50.0
16-17 yrs*	40	14	35.0
18-19 yrs	54	8	14.8
20+ yrs	35	9	25.71
Subtotal:	141	37	

*Younger participants are from pool of secondary students enrolled in project's secondary sites.

SOURCE: MIS data bank, Participant Program Summary, Youthwork, Inc., 12/16/79.

Social Status of the Participant. The 87 participants in the "target population" groups of the eight studied academic credit projects had a forty-five percent termination rate.[9] These groups included school dropouts, offenders and the handicapped. This last group of participants had the lowest (31%) termination rate of the three groups. The older two groups had rates of 57% (dropouts) and 47% (offenders). These latter two youth groups were also found by Magnum and Walsh (1978) to be difficult to retain in employment programs.

> With few exceptions, most programs directed solely towards the hard-core disadvantaged, or those that isolated the hard core, have been failures at least according to prevailing statistical norms. (Magnum and Walsh, 1978:165)

Five of the academic credit projects had between one and fifteen youth they were unable to serve because of the special needs of male youth offenders. In particular, behavioral problems of these youth caused them to be terminated by the project or to be taken out of the project by the courts. They were disruptive and poor attenders. Asked about a student who was recently terminated (sent by a court to a treatment center for delinquent boys) a staff member says:

> Tom? Oh please! Do you know that Tom threatened my life? Not to my face but he told someone else he was going to get me. I really had very little to do with Tom for a long time because his attendance in my classes was so poor.

Discussing this particular youth with his counselor at the treatment center, the on-site observer relates the counselor's opinion:

---

[9] Figures derived from Table 6 of this chapter.

> You have to understand the system. A kid is caught five times before anything happens to them. By that time, the kid has already seen the advantages of what he has done, and he has seen that nothing happens. They get into a program like this after they have had about ten chances. They are not used to being accountable to anyone. They have either been allowed or they have forced people to let them do what they want. He loses his morals, he does not feel like he should be a good son, etc., because street-life does not reinforce that. On the street, if you think like that, they will tell you you are crazy; you should be looking out for yourself. A lot of kids come into this place and do not see themselves as having to do anything. It is hard to make them see there is something out there for them to achieve.

This particular target population proved to be difficult for the projects on the whole to retain and serve. Previous dropouts and participants with low education levels also posed curriculum, counseling and staff-time problems. A participant such as Tom demonstrates the current inability of most projects to meet basic remedial education needs of some cohorts of youth. A staff member says:

> No one here was prepared to give extensive academic help to Tom. It is too bad that we do not have someone to do that. It is a hard question, what to do with a student like Tom.

The low reading level and basic education needs of participants may also be responsible for over ten older youths' self- or project-terminating at one project alone. As Mangum and Walsh also found:

> Herein is one of the dilemmas of all employment and training programs. Many of its clients--especially the disadvantaged youth--not only lack basic education skills, but often are not interested in achieving them. (Mangum and Walsh 1978:104)

There is some indication from the protocol data that older participants are responding to what one on-site observer called "the ratio between age and lack of credits". It has been observed that older participants with remedial education needs are embarrassed and frustrated by their lack of knowledge. They are also discouraged by their unsuccessful academic careers and the task of catching up with their peers. One teacher reports on such a student:

> He was painfully aware of his limitations and went to great extremes to mask those limitations... He would do a paper in class and then be so embarrassed by it that he would throw it away instead of handing it in. His handwriting and his spelling were atrocious.

Originally, seven projects were not fully prepared to meet the YETP remedial education needs of their participants because they miscalculated the basic skills needs of the participants. Since inception, two of the new in-school projects and all of the alternative school and post-secondary projects have been increasingly hiring staff who have backgrounds in special education/remedial education. Retraining of staff has also been occurring to change curriculum and course offerings to meet the educational needs of these participants. Counseling services have also been emphasized, At the alternative school which has hired new project staff, the on-site observer discusses the staffing situation:

> It is interesting to note that the two teachers who were asked to leave the program at the end of their first semester of involvement were the two teachers loaned to the program from the area's public schools. At least two of the teachers who are new to the program this year have extensive experience teaching in settings other than public schools.

New persons hired at this project for Fall 1979 include a teacher with psychological counseling as well as classroom teaching experience, a teacher from an alternative education setting, and one teacher specializing in remedial education.

Sex of the Participant: Special Case for Women. From the protocol data, the majority of females who left the projects did so for child care reasons or because of pregnancy. Mangum and Walsh (1978) noted:

> Counselors estimated that despite their best efforts, less than 30% of the need for child care was met, which probably accounted for "care of the family" being another major reason for dropouts, especially among female enrollees. (Mangum and Walsh, 1978:140)

At one alternative school, six of the eight females who left the project did so for these reasons. One of the in-school project staff members discussed terminations and remarked:

> Then there are two girls who are in holding because they are pregnant and are embarrassed about being seen at school. They say they will come back after their babies are born.

Whether these women will return to the projects is unknown. All the pregnant participants at the three in-school and three alternative school projects do plan a two to three month maternity leave, with the project staff planning for their eventual return. The one observed post-secondary female participant who became pregnant left the program permanently. An on-site observer relates one alternative school's staff discussion on a pregnant student:

> They turn to discussing one of the students who is due to deliver a baby this month. One teacher does not want to deal with her in the educational structure, feeling that the student cannot handle this presently. Two other staff members want to stay in contact with her so that they can be sure she will return to school after the birth of the baby.

This project, in response to the problem of teenage pregnancy (which several other projects have also noted to be on the increase), is now planning to schedule some special talks and lectures on this topic. This is the first year they are considering adding curriculum on pregnancy because as the on-site observer explains:

> Last year there was no willingness to discuss pregnancy and parenting at all because of the classic view that this would encourage women to become pregnant.

Child care is also a problem for these young mothers. It is expensive and difficult to find. Resolution for the mothers who have left the projects or have enrolled with children already present appears to be having their parents help out. One sixteen year old pregnant woman who was considering returning to school via an in-school project remarked:

> I am lucky because my Mother said that she will babysit for me after the baby comes, and she is only charging me $20 a week.

One alternative school allows their participants who are mothers to bring their children to school. This is the only project which provides child care or allows young children to remain with their mothers at the project. The children remain with their mothers in the school classroom, and the school seems to have accommodated the disruptions which sometimes occur. The on-site observer at the projects says of her site visits:

> I have held babies and I have fed babies bottles while students take tests. Many of the students consistently bring their young children to class.

In the coming year, it will be important to document how the projects continue to react to and plan for the special needs of this this student population.

V. Re-enrollment of Terminations

During start-up for Fall semester 1979, the Academic Credit Projects had to fill the vacancies created by nonreturning participants. Of the eight projects under study, only one was reported to have actively and thoroughly tried to find and re-enroll nonreturnees. The on-site observer reported:

> This summer the program had been carrying a full load of students. When school resumed in September, they found that they had lost 21 students from the program. Instead of filling these slots with new students, the school conducted an intensive search effort by calling and going to homes, contacting parole officers and court counselors, and sending the word out through other students that staff wanted to talk with them. Through this effort, 11 of those students lost over the summer were reinstated in the program and the balance of the program slots were filled with new students.

Three other projects reported some contact initiated by participants who had left the projects. At one project, participants terminated for chronic absenteeism were trying to get back into the program. The on-site observer related:

> The director said the strangest thing was that several of the ones who had been terminated because of their poor performance (the project cutting policy in effect) had been calling and asking if they could come back into the program. The director thought that the true reason had to do with the fact that they were given jobs and not so much that the classroom was important to them. One of the males who had left the program and was over eighteen years old had tried to get back in because he found out how difficult it was to get a job outside without a degree.

During attempts to keep students from self-terminating, staff at two projects remarked on the parents role in self-terminations. An on-site observer reports on two staff member's discussions on what they felt had been occurring:

> They talked about the extremes in parenting they have noticed--those who know nothing about what their children are doing, and those who monitor every movement.

Both of these projects lost two youths from parent over-interference in the youths lives. A post-secondary site observer conveys a teachers discussion of a student who dropped out.

> The teacher talked about how they lost a really good student in part because of her mother's harrassment becoming too much.

From the experience of another project, few parents became involved in, or were interested in their children's educational attainments. At a staff meeting, the director instructed the project staff not to expect many parents at the upcoming school-parent meeting. Based on poor turnout from past efforts, the observer reported the director's instructions:

> The director points out not to have high expectations for parental turnout at the conference, even though telephone calls are made and letters sent out saying that grade reports will not be given unless the parents pick them up. Last years attendance at the conference was very low.

VI. Youth Involvement

> In our system, state operated schools may not be enclaves of totalitanism. School officials do not possess absolute authority over their students. Students in school as well as out of school are "persons" under our constitution. They are possessed of fundamental rights which the state must respect... students may not be regarded as close-circuit recipients of only that which the state chooses to communicate. They must not be confined to the expression of those sentiments that are officially approved. (Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District, 383 U.S. 503 (1969) in Bersoff 1976:107)

Over the past ten years minors have won the right to free speech and rudimentary due process, yet:

> Not withstanding the salutory effect of these decisions, children remain, like Ellison's hero, invisible persons whose views are infrequently evoked and whose wishes are rarely controlling. (Bersoff, 1976:109)

Seven of the eight Academic Credit for Work Experience projects supported and encouraged youth to make their own decisions regarding their educational experience. While ideologically project staff desired input from participants, in practice they found this difficult to obtain. Individually, youth did have impact and input on their elective coursework, learning contracts, and work site placements. But collectively, at only one project was there visible influence from participants. At this project:

> After meeting with counselors, the entire school gets together as a group where the students discuss problems and ideas. These all-school meetings have been occurring for a long time at the project and are the traditional method of getting student input and feedback from the staff. At previous staff meetings I have heard serious discussions by the full staff on issues brought up through these all-school meetings and counseling sessions. I have seen staff make adjustments and changes in programs, curriculum, and personal interactions with students because of these meetings.

The other seven projects which have tried to get youth involved in program design and services have been unable to get the students organized. Three of the projects have student councils, and another project is organizing one, but these have not proved successful in impacting on the projects as participants do not use them as a vehicle to promote change. Asked if the project had a structure for student input, a director of a post-secondary project said:

> Yes, some, but the students do not use them. I have a mixed reaction to the student role. On the one hand, I have always advocated student input. On the other, the students have to take the initiative, they cannot be forced. I know in some classes the staff have given students' direct training on impacting on the system. They still just do not do it.

At a staff meeting on the design of the upcoming Fall 1979 curriculum, the teaching staff asked about ways of gaining student input. The observer reported on the alternative school's staff response to the question:

> The director says attempts have been made and were always abortive The students will simply not devise a list of topics themselves. One staff member says they have always had a suggestion/remarks section on the course selection form and the students have always either not used it at all, or only sketchily.

When a director was asked why students did not take advantage of providing input on their project, s/he said:

> I have considered that a great deal. The best I can come up with is that they just do not think in collective terms. They act individually. I have been appalled at their lack of ability to operate in groups. For example, their total lack of ability to run a meeting. They never take any formal group action, though I do think they have input on an informal, individual basis.

The President of the student organization at this post-secondary project was asked if s/he was encouraged to make her/his own decisions. The reply:

> No, not really. When I came in, I wanted to go to school and knew this was a good opportunity. So I came in thinking I would listen to them and not run off at the mouth. They know more than I do, so I will listen to their advice.

A passive desire to be "taught" is evident at the post-secondary projects, but is not present at the in-school or alternative school projects. For secondary students, it appears that the youths either do not care or do not "know enough" to seek to impact on the projects. One teacher said:

> The problem is that the students do not have their own interests when they come into the program. They have never been encouraged to have their own interests.

A critical problem regarding minor's right to choice in their education occurs at the secondary school level. Youth have mandated coursework to follow and accomplish. This obviously conflicts with their options to decide their own course of action. At the one project where there is no participant input, a teacher, when asked why, exclaimed:

> But I have a syllabus I am responsible for! Maybe I do not understand you?

From another project, during staff meeting discussing youths chosing their own courses, the on-site observer reported their discussion:

> The staff discussed how there have been times when students did not pick a course which enhanced a certain area of learning they were required to cover. A teacher asked the director what should be done in these cases, and s/he responded "I am not prepared to answer that now".

At the secondary project and post-secondary level, participants have little choice in their curriculum and coursework as core courses are mandated by the affiliated education institutions. Where there does appear to be youth input at all eight academic credit projects is in the area of choice of work site and electives. This is contingent though on what is offered and available at the projects.

VII. Motivation

All the Academic Credit for Work Experience projects have experienced difficulty motivating participants to learn, and more particularly, attend regularly. Absenteeism has been the most difficult problem consistently facing the projects in providing services to participants. This is more of a problem for those projects serving youth under 18 years old than those serving an older population. The youths in the two post-secondary projects are more responsible on the whole in attending to their coursework, and in going to class and their work place. At the most basic level, participants may not be motivated to attend projects regularly or may leave projects because they would rather not be in school. It is not known how many, but it appears some participants are self-terminating because they do not like or want to be in school. At one post-secondary project, the on-site observer relates a conversation s/he had with a teacher:

> Sandy tells how she had flowers delivered at home last week from a student who had dropped out of the program. Attached to the flowers was the note: I hope you are not disappointed in me for quitting school. I think it is the right thing for me. I hope I can still come back to talk to you sometimes.

Several strategies have been tried at the projects to remedy this problem of absenteeism and lack of youth motivation. Two projects have offered participants financial reimbursement for attending class. Payment to students for time spent in class has not apparently induced the youths to become better attenders. An on-site observer conveys a summation of one director's sentiments:

> The director said that originally s/he thought that the money for class was an incentive, but s/he finally decided that s/he does not know what motivates these kids. S/He is sure it is not money. Paying for attending class has not kept students in class, and they are not willing to do anything for a job either.

At the other project, the on-line staff have experienced the same phenomena. One staff member said of paying a youth to attend classes:

> It just did not seem to be a motivating factor. It did not improve attendance. And it has caused bad feelings with the schools. None of the counselors, teachers, or principals liked it. They did not believe in it and did not feel it was right.

Employers also lamented student absenteeism and commented on the fact that money did not seem to motivate the youth. At an employer/project staff meeting, the on-site observer sums up the comments:

> Five or six employers agreed that absenteeism was a problem, especially at the beginning of the work relationship with the student. One commented that he thought the money was not the drawing card, but perhaps the credit was.[10]

One of the reasons why it has been so difficult to motivate youth under 18 years old in the in-school and alternative school projects may be because of the poor self-concept and the lack of self-esteem many of the participants have. A classroom account follows which demonstrates the negative image many of the youth have of themselves:

> The director asked the students to write down their good qualities. The students are doing this now and seem to be having a very difficult time finding ten qualities about themselves which are good. I hear one student say 'there ain't nothing good about me'...The students are then asked to name their bad points. The students have no particular difficulty doing this.

---

[10] It is interesting to note here that these sentiments do not coincide with those of previous YNPS findings where it was reported that credit was not a major inducement to join the academic projects for under 18 year old youth, but was for older youth. (See YNPS Interim Report #2, 1979:39.)

These same youth lack self-confidence and (positive) self-assertiveness. A staff member said:

> It is so hard for them to fight for themselves. One of my students told me there were not enough books to go around in one of his school classes and that he did not get one. When I asked him what he planned to do he said 'I will just copy from someone who has a book'.

In the past, most of these youth had encountered failure. As one on-site observer was told by a project staff person:

> She reminded me that they were working with a population that were often frustrated and had experienced much failure.

The relationship between feeling competent or successful in their endeavors impacted on the youths school experiences and attendance. One staff person said:

> I have noticed that when he is not doing well at a job he becomes discouraged in school. One of our goals for him last year was that he come to a realistic assessment of his own abilities. He always tries to look like he knows what people want, like by carrying an empty briefcase, but he is not true to himself.

Individual successes with motivating youth to responsibly attend classes and their work placements have occurred when their experiences resulted in a positive change in self-perception. Two factors appear to account for enhancing youth motivation: 1) a supportive relationship with a staff(s) member and, 2) an appropriate job placement. Both factors were found in an earlier YNPS study[11] to enhance youth participants program experiences and attendance. Academically, many are, or continue to be failures. It is not surprising then that a positive relationship with an authority figure and/or success with a job placement would impact on a youth's self-image and would result in improved attendance. One teacher discusses the changes in a previously "problem" student who had a supportive and involved project counselor and a good job placement.

---

[11] YNPS Interim Report #2, 1979:47-51.

> Trisha has been the greatest change of all! I do not know if you know but she has finally had a successful work experience. Her self-confidence seems to have been crucially effected by the successful work experience and she has continued to be a very hard worker at school. One of her problems in my class is that she does not feel at home in English (Trisha is Hispanic) although she is definitely bilingual. All her behavioral problems which took so much of everybody's time last year are not getting in the way now. People have been really amazed! I think Trisha used to use her behavior to compensate for her feelings of inadequacy. Now she does not feel inadequate.

Crucial to a successful work placement and to the student's motivation is that the job be neither simplistic or meaningless for the youth. Finding an appropriate placement for the skill level, maturity, and interest of the youth is difficult. In Trisha's case, the first few work placements in in the private sector did not work out. When the staff finally found her a job in a sheltered work shop (factory work), she was able to accomplish the necessary work tasks and with encouragement from staff experienced success.

Providing youths with behavioral/psychological problems with supportive staff relationships and a good job placement is staff-intensive and time-consuming, but when it occurs it has proven rewarding to both staff and youth.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Academic Credit

Awarding academic credit for work experience necessitates flexibility of approach as there are no standardized rules applicable to this endeavor. It is a highly individualized process and requires constant modification to meet the needs of individual youth, new institutional development and available resources. The academic credit projects have been undergoing shifts and modifications in their delivery of credit services and competencies. The majority of the projects share similar concerns. They have tried comparable as well as different methods of developing competency learning contracts and credit arrangements.

Recommendations to Youthwork, Inc.

(1) A means of information sharing and problem solving should be developed for the Academic Credit for Work Experience projects so that directors and/or on-line staff can share their knowledge and experiences in developing a linkage between education and work.

(2) Technical assistance in the area of implementation of academic credit for work experience should be made available to the academic credit projects. Assistance in the development of competency statements, objectives and behavioral and/or paper and pencil tests would be most practical and beneficial. Any assistance offered must be sensitive to local needs and conditions, and most importantly, feasible at the local level.

(3) Ample time should be given the academic credit projects in the area of granting academic credit for work experience before these projects are "evaluated". Any interim evaluation which occurs should be sensitive to the evolutionary process of developing the credit/work relationship.

To develop a feasible approach to awarding youths academic credit for work experience based on measurements other than traditional state or LEA competency tests, or to develop the means of alternative (work experience) approaches to gaining "traditional" competency levels, is staff-youth intensive. To individualize learning experiences and to develop measurements of acquired skills or knowledge which meet the educational needs of individual youth requires further teacher-counselor time; much more so than is necessary in traditional, standardized schools.

Recommendations to Youthwork, Inc.

Project Organization

(1) Teacher and counselor staff-youth ratios must be higher than traditional school ratios. Developing and testing competency levels of individual youth entails considerable individual staff-youth attention. It is doubtful that the process can stabilize to the extent that this type of curriculum and approach to credit can ever match the traditional school staff-student ratios, e.g. one teacher to 27-35 students.

II. Program Administration

Several projects which are responsible for fulfilling multiple educational needs of youth should designate at least one staff member whose responsibility is to coordinate the curriculum, credits and courses at the project. Where such a person or role is lacking, some youth are not provided with coordinated services either in terms of acquiring the type and number of credits they need to graduate or in ensuring that they are in the most appropriate classes.

Recommendations to Youthwork, Inc.

(1) For those projects that offer a complexity of services to youths there should be required at least one staff member(s) responsible to see that educational requirements are met.

In innovative education programs it is imperative that projects provide an administrative structure which allows for problem solving and implementation of decisions. The administrative structures of the academic credit projects function between the extremes of no means for staff involvement in problem-solving to a lot of problem analysis but no implementation of decisions. Either case causes staff dissatisfaction and hinders the potential impact of these programs.[12]

---

[12] For a discussion of the relationship between different decisions and execution, see Pressman and Wildavsky, 1979:191 or Demone et al., 1973, particularly chapter 8.

Recommendations to Directors of the Academic Credit Projects

(1) For the projects to operate efficiently and effectively, a means for on-line staff problem analysis and input must be operational, and just as importantly, follow-up and/or implementation of decisiions must occur.

III. Retention and Motivation

The target populations identified to be served, among them youth offenders and school dropouts, is a difficult population to retain in the projects. For projects serving secondary aged youths (14 to 18 years old), the 16 to 17 year old youth are particularly prone to self- or project-termination. One project likened their project terminations to "deadwood". These youth present numerous problems to projects in terms of attendance, curriculum and staff time. Projects have responded to the special needs of these populations by adding or increasing the numbers of remedial education and counseling staff persons to their projects. Despite these additions, youth are still terminating. There is some evidence that several projects (n=3) are changing their admittance standards in favor of younger youth with higher reading levels and more credits than were admitted into the projects last year (1978). The goal appears to be more selective admissions to ensure higher retention rates.

Recommendations to Department of Labor

(1) There is a need for further research on how to retain "problem" youth populations in school-to-work transition programs.

(2) Two factors which appear to work for "problem" youth populations are individualized staff-youth relationships and good work experiences.

(3) If it is not desired for projects to take those participants which projects have found themselves best able to serve, incentives for admitting and retaining special groups (offenders and young dropouts) should be developed. Disincentives, such as reliance on termination figures should be examined, as this group of participants has traditionally been difficult to serve.[13]

Recommendation to Youthwork, Inc.

(1) MIS data reports should be interpreted with caution as some of the figures are misleading. This is particularly true of the participant retention figures which were found to be inflated with participants signing up for the program but never appearing, or leaving during the first weeks of program start-up and orientation.

Paying youth participants for remedial education class time at two projects is not perceived by the on-line staff to be working as an attendance incentive. Both these projects serve (more than the other academic credit projects) a hard-to-reach youth population (in terms of remedial skills).

---

[13] See Magnum and Walsh, 1978:Chapter 9.

Recommendations to Youthwork, Inc.

(1) An internal analysis of these two projects which are paying youth for classtime spent on remedial education needs to be undertaken. Because they are serving a different population group than the other academic credit projects, a cross comparison does not seem to be applicable. Interview and observation from the youth of this incentive is also needed.

(2) Solutions to the problems of young mothers needs to be explored. Pregnancy and child-care related reasons are the primary cause of terminations of female participants. Possibilities include sex and birth control education, child-care allowance, and/or the provision of day care. This latter potential service could be integrated into a work experience project, where program participants help design and run a day care center under supervision of qualified staff.

IV. Youth Involvement

Youth are involved with the projects in deciding their elective courses and work placements. On a one-to-one basis, youth are involved in discussing plans and actions which directly effect them. Such interaction is instigated by the youth. Often youth do not feel they have the authority or lack the knowledge to make informed decisions or impact on their program experiences. Core courses or basic skills classes, where mandated by the state, LEA or post-secondary institution do not allow for youth input. Youth input has been solicited, but not obtained, on a youth group basis consistantly.

Recommendations to Youthwork, Inc.

As a principle, youth involvement and decision making should be encouraged. Programs should be encouraged to explicitly state how such involvement will be sought and the institutional means created to sustain it. Where possible, staff should make the youth aware of their potential for impact and the different choices available to them.

CHAPTER FOUR

EXPANDED PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT

In late 1978 and early 1979, Youthwork, Inc. funded twelve programs within the focus area entitled "Expanded Private Sector Involvement". As with the other three programmatic models, this one was to:

> learn more about in-school programs and their effectiveness and to promote cooperation between the education and training and employment systems. (Youthwork, Inc., 1978:2)

The decision to focus on this approach to in-school programs was both timely and appropriate. Timely in that not only is the development of linkages between employment, training and education services a major goal of YEDPA (DOL, 1978:3), but also because there is an expressed need to involve the private sector directly in addressing what is an issue of critical national concern. As but one instance, a series of workshops conducted shortly after passage of YEDPA in 1977 identified involvement of this sector in youth programs as an area for serious investigation. It was noted that:

> In each of the five workshops, concern was expressed regarding the limitations of the use of the private sector for work experiences because this sector can and should make key contributions to these programs. (DOL, 1978:7)

The appropriateness of this focus area choice comes from the knowledge that over eighty percent of all jobs exist within the private sector business community (Graham, 1978:1; Pressman, 1978:2). Additionally, youth represent one group which is affected by the persistence and expansion of structural unemployment in our society (Robison, 1978:9). To address this problem Robison goes on to state:

> Government programs to train and provide jobs for the hard-to-employ will continue to play an important role in national manpower policy. Its main emphasis is on the need for substantially greater private sector involvement in efforts to aid such groups both directly and in partnership with government programs. (Robison, 1978:9)

Program Characteristics

The private sector programs funded by Youthwork, Inc. are located in eight states and include four sites on either coast and four sites in the Midwest. One of the twelve programs is located in a major city with a population over one million, nine programs are in cities with populations ranging from approximately 50,000 to 500,000, and two programs are located in rural areas.

The initial plans for the twelve programs projected a range of students to be served from a low of 45 to a high of 500. Vocational Exploration Programs (VEPs) in these private sector programs do not exceed approximately 175 students at any program site. Less intensive involvement by students through their presence at special lectures, classroom career exploration, or other activities accounts for the high participation rate of 500 students at one project. Numerous other students who are not officially enrolled in the programs also receive program benefits when such activities as guest lectures occur within their school. The total number of students who received benefits from direct participation in these 12 programs, during their first year of operation, was approximately 1614 youth.

This chapter is based upon data collected at seven of the twelve private sector sites. Program characteristics are provided in Tables 1 through 3. The reporting programs have been in operation from twelve to fifteen months. Four of the reporting sites represent programs which were developed through modifications of previously existing programs. The primary modification of these existing programs was the addition of specific private sector vocational exploration. Three sites instituted programs where there had formerly been none. The operators of the seven reporting sites (cf. Table 1) included two LEAs (public schools), two community based organizations (CBOs) and three private non-profit organizations. Of the three newly established programs as a result of Youthwork, Inc. funding, one is operated by each of the organizational types (LEA, CBO, public non-profit). Of the two rural sites which provided data, one is operated by a CBO and the other by a private non-profit organization. With the exception of one CBO program and one private non-profit program (neither being a rural site), all of the reporting programs are conducted within facilities provided by the local school systems (cf. Table 2).

TABLE 1

TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING PRIVATE SECTOR PROGRAMS

Organizational Types	Reporting Sites[a]	Total Sites[b]
LEA	2	5
CBO	2	3
PNP	3	3
GO	0	1

[a] Reporting sites are those seven which provided data for this report.

[b] The total number of private sector programs represent the 12 funded by Youthwork, Inc.

Major activities provided at all 12 programs are listed by program in Table 3. Classroom training includes specific skills training and/or employment skills which prepare students to apply for a job (i.e., filling out applications and interviewing). Career exploration includes activities which present various careers within the classroom through such approaches as films, texts and guest lectures. At work sites, career exploration involves business tours, observation of employees and discussions with employers. Vocational exploration programs (VEP) occur when a student is exposed "to jobs available in the private sector through observation of such jobs, instruction, and, if appropriate, limited practical experience" (Federal Register, April 3, 1979:20014). At the private sector programs the length of this

TABLE 2

PRIVATE SECTOR PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Program[a]	Operator[b]	Area Population Range (in thousands)	Where Program is Conducted[c]	Actual/Projected Number of Students to be Served[d]		Program Status[e]	Program Began[f]
A	LEA	50-250	school	124/288	43.1%	EEP	Oct.
B*	LEA	50-250	school	108/140	77.1	EEP	Oct.
C*	LEA	50-250	school	131/128	102.3	EEP	Nov.*
D	LEA	50-250	school	559/500	111.8	NP	Dec.
E*	LEA	50-250	school	54/63	85.7	NP	Dec.
F*	PNP	50-250	training center	55/64	85.9	EEP	Nov.*
G	PNP	250-500	training center	120/104	115.4	NP	Nov.
H	PNP	rural	school	81/90	90.0	EEP	Nov.
I	PrNP	1000+	school	177/150	118.0	EEP	Oct.
J	PrNP	rural	school	80/96	83.3	NP	Dec.
K	PrNP	250-500	school	71/114	62.3	EEP	Jan.
L*	GO	50-250	school	54/60	90.0	EEP	Feb.

---

[a] Programs with asterisks did not provide data for this report.

[b] LEA = local education agency; CBO = community based organization; PrNP = private non-profit; GO = government office.

[c] Training centers are located at facilities owned by these community based organizations and private non-profit operators.

[d] Operating year to date. Source: Blackstone Institute MIS reports, December 16, 1979.

[e] EEP = expansion of existing program; NP = new program.

[f] The earliest starting date was October 1978. Programs with asterisks have ended.

phase varies from only a week or two to several months. *On-the-job training* contracts can be entered into by private sector employers if the youth participant is "engaged in work which provides knowledge or skills essential to the full and adequate performance of the job" (*Federal Register*, April 3, 1979:20011). *Academic credit* is awarded at ten program sites. Three sites have attempted to acquire *community partners* who will participate on a one-to-one basis with program participants. These persons may be present or retired businessmen or volunteers interested in working with youth.

TABLE 3

PRIVATE SECTOR PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Program/ Operator[a]	Classroom Training	Career Exploration	Vocational Exploration	On-the-Job Training	Academic Credit	Community Partner
A/LEA	x	x	x	x	x	x
B/LEA[b]	x	x	x	x	x	
C/LEA[b]	x	x	x	x	x	
D/LEA	x	x	x	x	x	x
E/LEA[b]	x	x	x	x	x	
F/CBO[b]	x	x	x	x	x	
G/CBO	x	x	x			
H/CBO	x	x	x	x	x	
I/PrNP	x	x	x		x	
J/PrNP	x	x	x			
K/PrNP	x	x	x		x	x
L/GO[b]	x	x	x	x	x	

---

[a] LEA = local education agency; CBO = community based organization; PrNP = private non-profit; GO = government office.

[b] These sites did not provide information for this report.

Analysis Format

The seven private sector programs which have supplied data for this current report are situated in three distinct settings. These settings include both traditional and alternative schools and a training center. The traditional schools (three programs) are that large majority of schools in this country which have a highly structured educational format. Alternative schools (three programs) tend to be flexible in their procedures and in some instances are designed to attract and educationally stimulate those students who have rejected and subsequently dropped out of traditional schools. Alternative schools also respond to the need of traditional schools to find a place for youth who disturb the traditional schooling process. Training centers (one program) are specifically designed to provide a technical skill which can be used in a specific field of employment. Education leading to a high school degree (or a GED) may be, but is not necessarily, a part of the training center approach to education.

Discussion of these programs, where appropriate, will be divided according to the settings in which the programs are being operated. This provides a key analytic framework from within which to examine more closely both the experiences encountered by the youth and success/failures of various program strategies.

In this present report five program components are reviewed: 1) the provision of academic credit; 2) youth involvement in program operation; 3) program contact with other youth programs; 4) staff/student contacts; and 5) program administration. It should be noted that as a result of different data collection emphases at the various programs, not all seven programs provided data for each of these areas. A concluding section provides both a summary of this chapter's contents and recommendations based on available data.

FINDINGS

I. Academic Credit

The provision of academic credit has occurred at ten of twelve private sector programs. Six of these programs have provided data which detail the amount of credit awarded as well as the complications involved in this process.*

Traditional Schools. Two programs operated within the traditional school setting have experienced quite different results in their efforts to provide academic credit. In the first instance the program is operated in a rural area by an organization which had no prior in-school programs. The program is operated in facilities provided by the school and takes place after the normal academic schedule. The staff for the program are present at the participating schools only during those late afternoon operating hours or during the school day when appointments with individual youth have been scheduled.

When this program began the several local school districts were approached in regard to the awarding of academic credit. No school expressed any particular interest in this aspect of the program. The best response that program officials received was "we will have to think about it". A reason for the lukewarm reception to this program component is reflected in one guidance counselor's comments about the ease by which students could already obtain credit. He stated:

---

*This is the only section of the findings for which data from the training center was available.

> We are having a credit explosion here. The results are that some kids can graduate when they are sixteen years old. No, I am not against the idea of granting academic credit for the program, but we have to look ahead to possible problems. If by granting academic credit for this program, it would allow more sixteen year olds to graduate--well, that might be a real problem. You have got to remember that a sixteen year old out of high school cannot find a job.

A second factor which contributed to the failure to initiate academic credit was that this program began in mid-December--well into the school year. At that point in time it was not feasible to attempt to initiate this process. However, during the program's second year of operation (1979-80), one school district began awarding academic credit and a second was in the process of recommending to the Board of Education that credit be awarded. In both situations only youth enrolled after the decision to award credit could receive credit. Ironically, at the second school there are no plans to enroll more students in the program. For those youth who are to receive academic credit it will be based on one-half credit for 150 hours of participation. Reflecting on the many means by which credit at present can be acquired, the field observer doubts that the participating youth need addtional credits from the program in order to graduate.

The second program in a traditional school setting is located in a major city and operated by an organization which has had considerable prior contact with the schools. The program is conducted during the regular school-day and after school by program personnel who are also members of the school faculty.

At this site, academic credit is awarded as "elective credits". This, as the field observer notes, avoids the problems of deciding what competencies are required for an experience to be comparable to a required course. One credit hour is awarded for program involvement totalling 200 hours. The awarding of academic credit is contingent upon criteria described by the field observer:

> There are no prescribed competency levels required for the unit of academic credit, only that the students must have participated in the program's activities faithfully and successfully. This means that the student was in attendance, except for excused absences, that he/she completed the field work of the outreach phase in a satisfactory manner, and that his/her performance in job situations was also satisfactory.

Alternative Schools. Each of the three programs in alternative school settings awards academic credit. One program, operated by a private non-profit organization, is located at facilities separate from the schools from which students are drawn. The program is operated during the school-day and it provides basic skills credit for reading and math classes (1/2 unit each) as well as one unit of elective credit for the work experience (120 hours involvement per credit, 4 credits per year). The factor which may have been most influential in the decision toward academic credit was a position by the school district to the effect that if the program was to operate during class time, the youth would have to receive two credits per semester--the amount they would have received during the normal school day afternoon.

Both other alternative school programs are operated within the established alternative school buildings. Furthermore, both provide only elective credits. In the CBO operated program five units are awarded per semester (representing over 60 hours of involvement; 170 units needed to graduate). When asked whether performance or competency levels determined the awarding of credit the field observer was fold the following:

> Attendance. That is one of the big things. They must be attending full time at their work stations. Also we check with supervisors to see if they are doing well--to see if they are living up to their contract. We record their hours on the job. It really takes more hours to get a unit with work experience than it does with our regular classes. I do not believe in just handing out credit.

The LEA program awards one-half credit each, per semester for the job orientation class and the work experience with the stipulation that one cannot receive credit for the latter without participating in the former. In this setting youth have the option to work toward either a high school diploma or a GED.

A notable occurrence in regard to the awarding of academic credit transpired at the LEA program. Prior to this program CETA program participants had not been awarded credit as the school districts would not do so without having students also participate in a job class. This joint venture between CETA and the LEA has brought about a means by which CETA youth program participants can acquire academic credit. The field observer notes:

> The prime sponsor has expressed the hope that this working relationship will align them with the school district more closely and that this relationship will continue after the current program ends.

Training Center. The CBO operated program is housed in facilities owned by and separate from the local school systems. The youth served by this program are predominately dropouts (N=87) and high school graduates (N=26) (Total N=120). Although academic credit is not available to youth at last report, negotiations on this topic have taken place. One program official relates efforts that have been initiated.

> We now have the city college teaching a class in our center which is basically focussed around an introduction to the college system. Some of our program trainees and other youth have begun taking courses at the city college. We also have one course that they are teaching here at our center on consumer education. As far as accreditation for the training program, we have not negotiated that yet. We see it as a long-term effort. We are still exploring accreditation for the high school level. This is a complex area. You have to identify all the schools or school districts, and there are many, to find out which school district each student belongs. Most of our instructors do not have teaching credentials, and that may also be a problem with the school accreditation, since they may not see our instructors as "legitimate". There are simply too many problems in working with the LEAs.

Summary. Based upon available information, the criteria for awarding academic credit at six programs include: 1) attendance, 2) hours involved in the program, and 3) participation/performance as as determined by their teachers/supervisors. There is no evidence that any specific competency levels need to be achieved to acquire these credits. Additionally, those programs awarding credit do so in quite similar amounts (equivalent to one to four credits per school year). With only one exception, credit is elective in nature. In that situation basic skills credit is awarded for participation in math and reading classes. At one alternative school program the awarding of academic credit has been one factor in the fostering of CETA/LEA linkages.

There is some question as to the actual need on the part of students for academic credit. The impressions received by observers is mixed. On the one hand, an observer notes the many ways in which youth can acquire credit. On the other hand, she also notes that it may serve as a double reward--income and credit--and thereby encourage youth to remain in school. At the LEA operated alternative school the observer notes that the youth need all the credits they can acquire. In contrast, at the prive non-profit operated alternative school, the observer notes that only those youth who know they are receiving credits feel they need these credits. This may be pointing out the fact that youth were either not informed that they would be receiving credits, they forgot, or they do not really need these credits. This latter case needs to be more thoroughly investigated.

One item which needs to be addressed is the lack of MIS statistical data which would suggest the true extent to which this program component has been utilized. (This also holds true for the awarding of GEDs.) This is an unfortunate result of MIS limitations which allow for only a limited number of services at each site to be recorded. Personnel at private sector programs have apparently identified other factors as being more important to record.

Finally, the ability to award credit appears, at least in part, to be linked to the structural incorporation of the program into the formal school day. Those programs which have done this (four sites), whether on campus or off campus, have had much more success in developing agreements with the local school systems.

II. Youth Involvement in Program Operation

Regardless of program setting, informal discussions appear to be the primary means by which youth become involved in program operation at six private sector programs. This process occurs predominately through brief encounters with a teacher or supervisor. Whether comments, criticisms and/or suggestions which are expressed during these encounters actually instigate program change on a regular basis is not at all clear.

Participation in formal councils or other bodies developed to help guide the program exists for youth at two of the reporting private sector programs. In these situations youth express directly to program operators their views of the program operation, possible changes, and their own experiences. The field observers at a program located in a traditional school setting related the following youth comments:

> One student commented that acceptance by the employers was important--they were treated "like adults". Another student was proud of "doing something for myself". It seems that the rejection by some employers was hard for several of the students to take. One student commented that: "it hurt, but it is part of growing up to learn to accept rejection". Another student, working as a receptionist for H&R Block, was obviously angered by the customers' demands, accusations, etc. She commented that she "would not lower herself to their standards".

At an alternative school youth actively participate in advisory group discussions about program related issues. One youth notes how he was involved in a discussion of hours of work and wages for the youth.

> They were talking about something like whether after you have been working so long should you get a raise? They did not decide anything. They will have another meeting in January. I told them that after you have been working nine months you should get more hours and a raise.

Plans for a similar level of participation at a second alternative school program are currently in progress. As with the informal routes for program input, the ultimate program decisions are made by the operators and not these councils. It is not clear how great an impact youth views have on program direction.

Elsewhere, youth involvement through formal channels has not been encouraged. It may be that these forms of involvement were not designed as primary components of the program but rather secondary or tertiary components which have never been actively addressed to date. At one alternative school, and after over a year of operation, the field observer notes:

> Youth involvement has to date been rather minimal. Although the proposal calls for active student involvement in the running of the program, there has been little if any attempt to get students to participate. However, a teacher-counselor and a social worker have begun a student council.

This level of formal involvement can also be found in a traditional school setting. After one year of operation, a field observer relates:

> At present time there is not avenue for youth to have direct input into program operations. During the discussion of the formation of an advisory council (which never materialized) the position of the director and the operating organization was that youth should be included on the advisory council. However, an advisory council is not actively being pursued. Some youth were approached about being on an advisory council, and were very receptive about the idea. Two students independently asked me if and when the advisory council that they had been asked to be on would start.

The primary means by which youth have input into the program is in making personal choices about their own involvement. Although no leeway exists as to the program components in which youth must participate, independent decision-making is encouraged within these various phases. While youth are continually encouraged to become actively involved in all program activities, this process becomes most apparent when decisions need to be made about work placement. Placements are sought which, as often as is possible, reflect youth career interests. Youth are free to reject a specific placement or request a change of work site. One field observers describes this process:

> After students have been on a job site for a few weeks they are queried to discover if they find the placement valuable, and if they want to stay or experience another placement. If they decide to change placements, they are questioned in regard to the options available and how they feel about each available opening at a job site.

In summary, it does not appear that the private sector programs were designed with high levels of youth involvement in program operation in mind. While formal means do exist in a few instances, informal channels are the primary means for this process to occur, if it does at all. The decisions in which youth are encouraged to participate involve primarily their own course within the program.

III. Program Contact with Other Programs

Five programs, three in traditional school settings and two in alternative school settings, have provided information which suggests that there has been a wide range of experiences in the area of program contacts. Ideally, the present programs should attempt to foster an exchange of ideas and information with other local efforts. This may also help strengthen the program's base in the community. Unfortunately, this process has not been pursued at all program sites.

Traditional Schools. The program operated in a rural area after the school day has had very little contact with other youth programs. With the exception of one summer program operated by the same organization, the only known contact occurred at the program's outset. Indeed, this program appears so isolated from other programs for in-school youth that one guidance counselor noted it was a "ghost program". The observer explains:

> There was not appreciable contact between the school district and the Youthwork program. In fact, he described it as "a ghost program", in that it functions autonomously and was not known to many people.

A second in-school program operated by a LEA at several schools during the school day has experienced considerably more success in contacting other programs simply due to its location within these schools. In this situation the program coordinators are situated in areas of the schools along with other special programs. One coordinator notes that this has been quite helpful to her.

> The situation I am in among the counselors from the NYC, ROP, and SAY projects is good. I get recommendations from the others and we work well together...I have considerable contact and support from ROP and NYC staff members since I work in the same offices as them.

Further, in one of the participating schools the program coordinator also operates the NYC program. The various work programs have also had to work together to assure they meet enrollment quotas.

The most extensive effort to link a program to others exists in the case of a private non-profit operated program. This program had contacts with the city's Youth Employment and Training Program built into the proposal. Other formal links were established with groups such as the Bureau of Cooperative Education and the Center for Career and Occupational Education Services. Comments from the field observer suggest the diversity of efforts to link this program to others.

> Contacts with YETP were built into the proposal and there has been an excellent and effective cooperative relationship. Through the program a paraprofessional is provided to YETP's Career Experience Center to work with the fiscal unit in handling student certifications, payrolls, and the like. Contacts with the organizations mentioned above are part of the program's on-going operations. Initially, there were contacts with these and other organizations, particularly on the part of the program director, to familiarize them with the program. There are continuing contacts with other programs' staffs to disseminate information about the program, its method of operation, etc.

The program is operated afternoons in the schools by teachers whose time is split between the program and their regular classes. A coordinator is also on hand all day at each school. The field observer notes:

> In each of the schools in which the program is functional, the program is recognized by many staff and students of the school as a school-based program. While the principals recognize the importance of the program to their schools, it is recognized as only one of many programs that are operational. Each program has some unique features and most of them make significant contributions.

Alternative Schools. As with the programs in traditional settings, these two programs reflect varying degrees of contact with other programs. One program, operated by a private non-profit organization, has had limited contact with other programs for in-school youth. This program is situated at a site other than the schools from which students are drawn and apart from agencies which make referrals. The extent of isolation can be illustrated by noting that this program has not had any known contact with another Youthwork, Inc. funded program in the same city. At a recent meeting, one school counselor asked if there would be more contact with the program this year than there was the prevrious school year. The counselor was informed by program personnel that steps were being made to facilitate this contact.

An LEA operated alternative school has developed a level of interaction with one CETA youth program and the parent school district. The desire by this program's staff to maintain a level of enrollment lower than originally called for has fostered these interactions. Most prominant of these has been the joint efforts of the operating LEA and CETA Prime Sponsor to meet enrollment figures while retaining the small size of the alternative school. The first step in doing this was achieved by linking the program with a CETA youth program. The CETA program supplied a number of youth while the Youthwork, Inc. program supplied job orientation classes and, for the first time, academic credit to the CETA program youth. One spinoff from this has been the request by an adjacent school district for the development of similar CETA/LEA working agreements.

Another means by which low school enrollment is being maintained is through the development of satellite programs. In these situations alternative school staff go to two other schools and provide job orientation classes. With the exception of the CETA youth program previously cited, the field observer notes that there appears to have been "very little exchange of ideas between youth programs in the community". Increased involvement in the district's more traditional school system may in time facilitate this process.

Summary. The five cases briefly presented suggest that contact with other youth programs may be facilitated by the physical location of the program. In two settings little effort appears to have occurred to sustain inter-program communication. Initial contact to share information is essentailly all that has occurred. These programs, located in both traditional and alternative settings are operated in relative isolation. One program is operated after school hours and essentially only uses school facilities, while the other is located at a site apart from the school from which youth are drawn. The three programs with greater contact/exposure to other programs (again representing programs from traditional and alternative settings) are all located within the schools whose students are being served.

IV. Staff/Student Interaction

The focus of this section is on the formal and informal contacts which occur between program staff and youth participants. As with previously discussed issues, the ability for these two groups to interact is in part dependent upon the proximity of the program to the schools being served.

Traditional Schools. The program operated in rural schools after the school day is in part constrained by the fact that program staff come into the schools to operate the program. The field observer notes:

> The only contact that occurs between staff and students outside of normal program activities during business hours relates to transportation (which has now been discontinued for students who work late), and some contact through other organizations such as churches.

It should not be construed that this program's staff do not remain in contact with program youth. Rather, only that the separation of the program from the schools being served necessitates contacts to be more formal and preplanned as opposed to spontaneous and informal.

At a second program, liaisons located in the schools interact with students to conduct the formal program components. Contact between program personnel and students continues outside the regular program through encounters both within and outside the school (e.g. in the halls, downtown).

The final program in this category uses faculty members of the participating schools to operate the program. The field observer explains that unless the students are "in one of the teacher's regular classes, the students do not have the opportunity of interacting with teachers during the school day". Availability of the program coordinator in each school is considerably greater. The field observer states that whenever he has visited with a coordinator "there have always been students stopping by". While there are few interactions outside of the regular program working period, those interactions which do exist are quite varied as noted by the observer:

> The reasons for student/staff interactions are varied. For example, they may be occasioned by the student's interest in telling the coordinator about a particular experience that he/she has had. The contact may arise as a result of a student's

> changed schedule, need to be absent from the program for a day, uncertainty about completing a form, etc. At times there are other reasons, e.g., the students at each school complain, at one time or another, to the staff about the cost of transportation.

Alternative Schools. Two of the three programs in alternative school settings (one operated in the schools being served and the other in separate facilities) are experiencing staff/student interactions similar to those programs in traditional school settings. Those interactions which exist are limited primarily to the conduct of program components.

The third program, located in a small alternative school is experiencing extensive interaction among staff and students. The field observer related the following thirteen months ago (March 1979):

> The small student body coupled with a closely knit staff has allowed for the meeting of program goals and has yielded some unexpected benefits. The most important one has been the ability to develop personal and meaningful interactions between staff and students...Because of the small student population, information concerning students' background, past, and present behavior is exchanged daily among staff members. This allows each staff member to know a student not just as a student but also as a person. This concern is reflected by the staff when expressing interest in not only a student's school work but in other aspects of his life. One can often see teachers and students joking and talking about outside activities between classes.

These observations were written at a time when this program was justifying why it should not be enlarged. The observer also noted more specific informal interactions such as lunch-time basketball games in which both staff and students participated. A more recent protocol (October 1979) reviews these statements and finds them to still be valid. Included in this same protocol are the views of one teacher concerning the value of informal interactions. The comments were made after a basketball tournament.

> I had a conversation with a teacher who played in the tournament, and these were his remarks: "I think we get more mileage out of this kind of activity with the boys than anything else." I asked, "What do you mean?" He replied, "Well, sometimes you do not get anywhere in a classroom wearing a shirt and tie, but if you can go down to the gym and play a good game with the kids, they often give you their respect. That respect, gained out there in the gym or the playground, can be carried over into the classroom."

Summary. In five of the six programs reviewed, the staff/student interactions remain primarily oriented toward program operation. Any differences which exist reflect a greater availability of program personnel. The sixth program is experiencing extensive interaction due to the program being an integral part of the alternative school and the small staff/student ratio.

V. Program Administration

The operation of a youth program, including the delegation of power, is the focus of this section. The data from five private sector programs have provided particularly clear descriptions of this process.

Traditional Schools. The first program is a rural program operated by a private non-profit program. As noted earlier, the staff conduct this program after school hours in facilities provided by the several participating school districts. Further, this is a newly created program (now one year old) and it represents a first venture by the sponsoring agency into the area of serving in-school youth. The key personnel and their roles are described by the field observer.

> The director has primary function as an administrator, however, her interaction with the students is on a crisis intervention basis. Whenever there is a problem with a student regarding placement, or what should be done to deal with the problem of an employer in relation to a student, the director is the one to handle this. She makes a final decision regarding what will be done. The assessment counselor makes appointments with students at their home schools during study halls and talks with them about where they would like to be placed (in work experiences).

Additional staff include a secretary who is "second in command" and "often ran the office" and an individual responsible for identifying job placements and coordinating transportation. This description of the secretary is a result of several changes in staff during the early months of the program. She was in effect the only stable staff member during this period of change and, as a result, newer staff have been in part dependent on her knowledge of the program's operation.

There exists no written formal administrative hierarchy for this program. At present the director makes the policy decisions for the program. The use of staff meetings, and individual weekly meetings with staff members have been initiated to "improve communication patterns between the director and the staff". Also, a consultant is utilized by the program to help facilitate long range planning.

A number of administrative problems have plagued this program. Foremost has been the high staff turnover within the program, in the sponsoring agency, and at Youthwork, Inc. (the funding agency). Transporting youth to and from work and even the office space allotted to the program (one small office for the entire staff) have been additional factors to contend with. The field observer relates some problems facing the current director.

> Staffing changes have made it difficult for the director to have a consistant view of the program. Much has been said about the physical space, and the lack of privacy which is evident within the one room. This has resulted in friction between the staff and the director because of "over-supervision".

The staff of a second program consists of the program director and the liaisons within each participating school. The director has no direct contact with students. Rather, she oversees coordination of program components and financial matters. The liaisons oversee all phases of the program which involve youth. This distribution of responsibility has not interfered with program operation. This may be most clearly substantiated by noting that the program served 559 youth during its first year (500 planned).

Two problems, both reflecting factors external to this program, have hindered administration of the program. The first was the late arrival of funds--well into the fall semester. As with many other programs this factor made it difficult to acquire participants. A second and perhaps more vexing problem has been a linkage to the state's employment department. This department was to identify worksites for program youth (approximately 100 youth were to be placed in work experiences). High turnover of contract officers (who only work one-half time for the project) has precluded successful fulfillment of this department's responsibilities to the program. As a result, liaisons have found it necessary to begin to identify work sites.

The third program operated in a traditional school setting represents an offshoot of a pre-existing program. The program, operated by a private non-profit organization, is housed in the schools served and conducted during the afternoon hours of the school day and after school. The key personnel for this program and their roles as described by the field observer include:

> The program director who has administrative responsibility for all aspects of the program, including contacts with schools, Youthwork, local agencies, the Board of Education, etc. The Coordinator of External Learning is responsible for the development of curriculum materials. The Guidance Counselor is responsible for student testing. The Administrative Assistant works directly with the Program Director and is the key contact with the Prime Sponsor regarding fiscal matters, processes, etc.

Program staff are located within each of the program schools.

> In each school there is a program office where the Coordinator and Neighborhood Assistant (an aide) are housed. The students have access to these offices and they can contact program staff without particular difficulty. In addition, in each school three teachers work with students (after school) and they are the direct means of students contacting staff of the program.
>
> The school Coordinators have the delegated responsibilities of supervising the school and student related activities and those of the participating teachers.

The decision-making authority for this program rests with the program director. The field observer notes that most decisions also involve consultations with appropriate individuals.

> Through a series of meetings, the Program Director develops a bases for decisions that are program related. For example, meetings are held with the Principals (attended by central staff and school coordinators) to define operational basis in the schools. At regular intervals, the Program Director and central staff meet with the three school coordinators to discuss program operations and strategies and decide on courses of action. In addition, the Program Director and Administrative Assistant meet at intervals with the school staffs responsible for records, payroll, time cards, etc., to resolve any problems, plans for required reports, etc.

The few problems which have been encountered by this program have most often been a result of interactions external to the actual operation of the program. There has been no staff turnover to date (over one year into the program) nor have such issues as transportation and identification of work experiences been major problems. Rather, the major problem to date has been the prolonged contractual process which has delayed program funding until well beyond the start of the school year--for two consecutive years. Fortunately, the program has been able to reduce the delay in program startup by using local funds which were reimbursed once contractual difficulties were resolved.

Alternative Schools. The private non-profit operated alternative school has recently gone through a transition from a non-participatory to a participatory administration. This has occurred as a result of a change of organizations coordinating the program's operation. Originally, this oversight responsibility had been delegated by the contract recipient to a related organization. The field observer notes problems encountered in this situation:

> The coordinating agency (original) made all major programmatic decisions. The coordinator insisted that he make these decisions and they were often not done in a timely manner. Program staff were locked into roles--not making decisions. The project director resigned due in part to difficulties in working with the coordinating agency.

The program now has greater staff input and has, after several months, identified the interim director as director. The field observer notes:

> Since the changeover in coordinating agencies, there has been brainstorming, problems are defined, decisions made and the staff is working well together.

The LEA operated program is located within a small alternative school. The current school has evolved from prior attempts with alternative schools in the community. The entire teaching staff has been drawn from the parent school district and all have had several years of teaching experience. This staff includes a program director who is responsible for the daily operation of the program; and assistant director/teacher who coordinates the state funded truant program and teaches the GED program; six classroom teachers, two of whom teach the job orientation class and coordinate work experiences; a social worker, a truant officer; three theacher's aides and a secretary all of whom are paid through CETA funds; and a research associate who gathers background information on students and handles the MIS.

The program director is responsible to both the prime sponsor and the school district. Below this administrative level, however, all program staff are on an equal basis. The field observer noted:

> The remaining staff are all on the same organizational level; that is, the assistant director does not in practice have more power than the teachers or the coordinators. They work together, and their efforts are cooperative. What has happened is that the program director will allow each individual a great deal of leeway for their component. For example: If the job coordinators come across an idea or a change to enhance their component they would bring it to the program director and she would usually ask for it to be put on paper, and then say follow it through. The same for the social worker. This kind of operating procedure encourages staff innovation and flexibility within the program.

The ultimate responsibility for this program rests with an assistant superintendent. When major program decisions must be made, such as changing the number of youth to be served, the program director relays desired changes to this higher level of authority. Any such request for a major program change often eminates from program staff. The field observer describes the reason for this process.

> A great many of the changes in the structure of the program come from the staff and goes up--from the teachers, from the coordinators, from the social worker. I think this happens because the program director is so overloaded with the mundane daily requirements of running the program that she does not have the opportunity to sit back and reflect upon where the program is going, and what it needs. Whereas, the line staff are involved in the actual goings on. They can see where the problems are and often times there is an informal discussion about what can be done to solve this problem before it is even brought to the program director. The staff is small--ten people. Of the ten, five of them were in the program at the beginning. The small staff allows for a great deal of communication, formally, and informally, and for the participatory type of administration.

Summary. Each of the programs reviewed has approached program administration from a slightly different perspective. While the results of each approach have been positive, there are pitfalls which one may wish to consider before initiating a program. Three situations suggest both positive and negative factors which may impact on program administration.

The first situation reveals a program administered by individuals located separate from the schools served. The logistics of this distance between the operator and the youth served has inhiibited to some extent the contact among these groups. More importantly the high staff turnover combined with the problems encountered when operating a rural program (e.g. distances, transportation) have impacted upon program administration.

A strong central administration has overseen the smooth operation of a second program. Staff at each school oversee local operation of the program. Factors enhancing administration include: lack of staff turnover, prior experience by the operating agency in the conduct of youth programs, and the establishment of the program in the schools served. (None of these factors exist in the first situation cited.)

A final situation has seen the revitalization of an alternative school. Administration has been participatory, allowing for each staff member to suggest and help implement program change. A small staff interested in the maintenance of a small school, establishment of the program as a part of the school system, prior experience in operating programs, and limited staff turnover, are all factors which have enhanced the conduct of this program.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The issues reviewed on the preceding pages and summarized below provide data which reflect research interests of both the Department of Lab. and Youthwork, Inc. In particular these data address the following broad research issues specified in the Department of Labor's A Knowledge Development Plan for Youth Initiatives Fiscal 1979.

1. Are there better approaches and delivery mechanisms for the types of career development, employment and training services which are currently being offered?
2. How can youth programs be better integrated to improve administration and to provide more comprehensive services to youth? To what extent are the programs already integrated at the local level?

In regard to agency collaboration Youthwork, Inc. has posited the following question:

1. What are the barriers to successful cooperation among these agencies and what strategies are utilized by these agencies to overcome them?

Data from seven programs located in traditional schools (three programs), alternative schools (three programs) and training centers (one program) clearly suggest that the location of the program is a key factor in the ability of the program to address such issues as the awarding of academic credit, program contact with other programs and the fostering of staff/student interactions.

Those programs linked directly to school systems, through such factors as 1) location (on the school campus from which the students are drawn), 2) time of day (during rather than solely after the school day), and

3) using faculty who are part of the schools, are more likely to be successful. More succinctly, it appears that the more integrated a program can become into the daily routine of the schools being served, the greater success the program may have in addressing these issues. Certainly there are additional factors which enter into the success of any program. However, the data suggest that an essential step is to ensure that the program is an integral part of the school whose youth it serves.

Academic Credit

Four of six reporting programs award academic credit to youth participants. Each provides elective credits in comparable amounts (equivalent to one to four units per school year). In addition one alternative school provides basic skills credit to youth who participate in math and/or reading programs. At a second alternative school, the awarding of academic credit has been one factor in the fostering of CETA/LEA linkages.

The criteria for awarding academic credit include 1) attendance, 2) hours involved in the program, and 3) participation/performance as determined by the youth's teachers/supervisors. There is no evidence to suggest that any specific competency levels need be achieved to acquire these credits.

Three of the programs awarding credit are located within the schools from which students are drawn and operate during the school day. This includes both alternative and traditional school settings. While the fourth program is located apart from the schools it also operates during school hours. In contrast, the two programs not awarding credit are in one case not affiliated to the local school districts and in the second case operated by an outside agency after the school day has ended. Those programs able to award credit have linked themselves more closely to the schools in which they operate.

Although youth are known to have received academic credit for participation, there is at present to statistical data to suggest how many youth are actually receiving this credit. This is known to be due in part to limitations of the MIS data collection system. Linked to this is the question of actual need on the part of participants for academic credit and its role as an incentive for participation. Observers have provided a mixture of information both for and against actual need for the awarding of academic credit.

Recommendations for Youthwork, Inc.

Youthwork, Inc. should develop guidelines specifying competency levels which youth must attain prior to receiving academic credit. Adherence to these guidelines would assure that youth served are being provided with known skills. Assistance in the development of any competency levels should include input from LEA personnel.

Given that academic credit was deemed of such importance that an entire focus area was created to investigate this issue, it would be appropriate for comparative purposes to collect this data in other focus areas as well. To that end, the MIS system's capabilities should be expanded so that academic credit data may be collected for all programs.

The actual need for academic credit and its importance as an incentive for youth participation should be reexamined. This investigation would help identify how critical a factor receipt of academic credit actually is for youth participants.

Youth Involvement in Program Operation

The six reporting programs do not appear designed with high levels of youth involvement in program operation as an objective. Informal channels such as discussions with a teacher or supervisor are the primary means for input in all of these programs. Formal councils exist in a few cases. However, as with the informal channels, it is not clear that youth opinions/suggestions/criticisms have any direct impact on program operations. The decisions in which youth are encouraged to participate involve primarily their own course through the program.

Recommendation for Youthwork, Inc.

As one focus of all programs is to assist youth in the school to work transition, it would appear appropriate for the programs to foster greater youth feedback to and participation in the decision-making process.

Program Contact with Other Programs

Contact with other youth programs is facilitated by program location. Whether in traditional or alternative settings, school based programs had greater contact with other programs. In contrast, the two programs with apparently limited contact were in one case operated at a location apart from the schools and in the other case operated after school hours.

One traditional school program facilitated contacts by identifying linkages within the original program proposal. Further, the program's staff are members of the school faculty and, therefore, may be more aware of other programs available to youth than would be staff brought in to operate the program.

The desire to maintain a small enrollment at an alternative school program has fostered a number of linkages with both the CETA Prime Sponsor and the parent school district. In the former case, CETA youth program enrollees are for the first time being given academic credit. This arrangement has resulted in a second school district expressing a desire to establish a similar relationship with the CETA Prime Sponsor. In the latter instance, involving the school district, the program has branched out into two of the school districts traditional schools.

Staff/Student Interactions

Five of six programs experience staff/student interactions which focus primarily around program operation. Access to staff by students is facilitated to some extent in three of these programs imply due to the programs location within the school served. While it is fair to make this assumption, the extent to which students take advantage of this availability is only discussed at one of the three programs. In this situation youth actively interact with the program coordinator.

At the sixth program, a small alternative school, staff and students interact both formally through program components and informally during lunch-time, between classes, and at other times during the day. Program staff have noted that these informal interactions have been extremely valuable when working with the youth.

Program Administration

The programs reviewed suggest that different approaches to the administration of programs can prove equally as successful. These approaches fall on a continuum from a strong central administration which oversees program operation to a participatory approach to administration. The most smoothly operated programs exhibit a clear sense of program purpose and direction.

Programs operating most smoothly, be they in traditional or alternative settings, possess several factors in common including: 1) development from pre-existing programs; 2) lack of turnover among staff; 3) location within the schools whose youth are being served; 4) staff members are either members of the faculty of the school served or are on the premises daily; 5) operators are experienced in working with the systems encountered when conducting an in-school youth program; and 6) the programs begin during the school day. As adherence to these factors diminishes, so to does the ease of operation of program administration. Of the five programs reviewed, the one which has faced the greatest administrative difficulties has had only one of the preceding qualities. It is operated in the schools served. However, this has been compromised by the fact that the staff come to the schools to operate the program, i.e., the program is not formally located at the schools, and it is operated after the end of the regular school day.

Recommendations for Youthwork, Inc.

In situations where a program's administration is not located in the schools being served, working liaison relations should be developed in which central program staff can work in concert with the school's staff.

For school-based programs, plans should be developed and implemented to relate the program and the program's students to the total school program, i.e., make the program an integral school component. Failure to create this linkage will reduce the commitment by school personnel to the program and thereby inhibit program operation. The six points noted above provide a starting point at which this process can begin.

Recommendations for the Department of Labor

As has been alluded to at different points in this chapter, in-school programs must begin with the school year. Failure to do so inhibits initiation of program components. To accomplish the synchronization of programs with the school year, programs need to be identified and funding negotiations completed at **least two** months before the onset of the school year. This will allow for a pre-program planning phase during which program implementation may begin (e.g., staff can be hired and trained, program components can be refined and initiated).

CHAPTER FIVE

CAREER AWARENESS

The career awareness focus area consists of fifteen projects funded by Youthwork. The Youthwork contract refers to the career awareness focus area as "Career Information, Guidance and Job Seeking Skills". A shared goal of the projects is to improve the transition of youth from school to work, by providing youth with career information, job-seeking skills, and counseling. The intent of this chapter is to describe the social and academic organization of these programs, and in particular how such program organization relates to the educational organizations to which the youth also belong.

The National Commission for Manpower Policy recommends that research on government CETA programs focus on the analysis of the strengths of different strategies (1978). Their report entitled, CETA: An Analysis of the Issues states:

> In view of the rapid and continuing growth of federal manpower programs, together with the deliverate shifts in programmatic emphasis, it would seem reasonable to assume that the efficacy of manpower programs, in their various forms, was well established. This is not the case, however. Not only is the efficacy of any single program more an article of faith

> than documented evidence, but also there are very few clues regarding the relative efficacy of alternative programmatic approaches (pp. 107-108).

Youthwork (1979) framed questions on policy issues for the career awareness focus area relevant to this chapter. These include questions about program models and service delivery. Specifically:

1) How are the Career Awareness Projects generally characterized in terms of their transmittal of information to participants? How were the services delivered to the students? What were the networks that were used, and were they either new networks or existing networks? (p. 41)
2) Who are the individuals who provide career information material to the project participants? How are they prepared and trained for the task? What are their levels of training and education? How long have the personnel been involved in providing career information? How effectively can peer counselors provide the information, compared with trained "professionals"? Are there different mechanisms for providing this information beyond peer counselors and professional counselors, such as business people and others in the community? (p. 42)

Program Characteristics. Twelve career awareness projects began in 1978-1979 as part of the intial 48 Exemplary In-School Demonstration Projects. Two of these twelve completed their contracts in Fiscal 1979. Meanwhile three additional Non-Competitive Projects joined the career awareness analysis area in the Fall 1979 because of similarities in project purpose to projects already in that area.

Five types of educational organizations operate the career awareness projects. (See Table 1.) The two local education agencies (LEAs) are school districts; one is in a metropolitan area (over 500,000 people), the other in a small city (between 50,000 to 100,000). Two consortia (CONS) represent joint efforts of school districts. One consortium links three separate districts in a rural area (population under 50,000), while the other involves 36 districts in a large metropolitan area. A third consortium in another large metropolitan area attempts to unite a board of education and a community college. One prime sponsor (CETA) operates a career information project in a medium-size city (between 100,000 to 500,000 people). Four community colleges (COLL) operate projects: two in metropolitan areas, one in a medium-size city, and one in a rural area. Five non-profit organizations (NPR) also sponsor projects: two in rural areas, two in medium size cities, and one in a metropolitan area.

Projected enrollments have ranged from 15 to 6000. Two sites served between 800 and 6000 youth, seven sites served between 100 and 400 youth, and six sites were under 100 youth. Five programs have had more than one operational site. In sum, this overview indicates that four projects operated in rural areas, one in a small city, four in medium-size cities, and six in large metropolitan areas. The geographic distribution has been three projects on the East cost, five in the south and southwest, four in the midwest, and three in the west and northwest. Career awareness projects were found in fourteen states.

TABLE 1

CAREER AWARENESS PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

program[a]	operator[b]	population[c]	sites	location[d]	dates[e]
A	LEA	500+	1	training center	10/78-6/79
B	LEA	50-100	1	school	10/78
C	CONS	500+	4	school	10/78
D	CONS	rural	3	school	11/78
E	CONS	500+	7	school	1/79
F	CETA	100-500	1	training center	10/78
G	COLL	500+	5	school	3/79
H	COLL	100-500	1	school	1/79
I	COLL	500+	1	training center	1/79-8/79
J	COLL	rural	NA	NA	NA
K	NPR	500+	24	school	11/78
			1	training center	
L	NPR	rural	1	training center	10/78
M	NPR	100-500	5	school	8/78
N	NPR	rural	1	training center	4/79
O	NPR	100-500	1	training center	6/79

---

[a] Program J did not provide data for this report. NA = not available.

[b] LEA = Local Education Agency; CONS = Consortium; CETA = Comprehensive Employment and Training Administration prime sponsor; NPR = Non-profit Organization.

[c] Training centers are located at facilities owned by the operator.

[d] Figure represents population range in thousands.

Program Models. Each of the fifteen projects has emphasized one or a combination of learning situations for the participating youth. These have included job-seeking skill training, personal awareness counseling sessions, information about different careers, training in group dynamics, on-the-job work experience, and counseling about personal directions for the future.

An analysis of service delivery at the various sites suggested four programmatic models. (See Table 2.) The four include 1) alternative school, 2) employment training, 3) in-school career awareness, and 4) work experience. A distinguishing feature for each of the four program models has been the context within which the learning experience took place, be it at the alternative school, at the employment training program, within the curriculum of a traditional school, or at the job site. Five exemplary project operators have administered two or more models under the same administrative umbrella.

Alternative School. Three projects have operated career awareness programs through alternative schools affiliated with the public school systems. The project operators (a consortium, a LEA, and a non-profit organization) respectively sponsor an alternative junior high, one staff member in an alternative high school, and two staff members and a day care program in a school for teenage mothers and mothers-to-be. Students have categorized their alternative school as the final option within the educational system by which they might achieve a high school diploma.

TABLE 2

PROGRAM MODELS AT CAREER AWARENESS SITES

Program	Operator	Alternative School	Employment Training	In-School Career Awareness	Work Experience
A	LEA				x
B	LEA	x			
C	CONS	x		(x)[b]	
D	CONS			(x)	x
E	CONS			x	x
F	CETA		x		
G	COLL			x	
H	COLL		x		
I	COLL		x		
J[a]	COLL				
K	NPR			x	x
L	NPR				x
M	NPR	x		x	x
N	NPR				x
O	NPR				x
		3	3	4	8

---

[a] Program J did not provide data for this report.

[b] Parentheses indicate sites where information was not available for this report, because the on-site observers focussed on another strategy within the total project.

Employment Training. One prime sponsor and two community colleges have operated the employment training strategy. This approach has featured planned sessions on job-seeking skills, employment opportunities, and personal awareness. Clients have actively sought the program because of these attractive features, hoping that it would help them make the transition from school to work. Two programs have extensively trained peers preparing them for the role of future trainers. The sessions have been independent of the school curriculum, meaning that the students have come outside of class hours. In the third instance, the students participated in an all-day, two month long program.

In-School Career Awareness. The in-school career awareness strategy introduces career information into the existing services already present at traditional high schools. Six operators sponsor such projects. The efforts consisted of either setting up career information centers in district high schools (two projects) or conducting workshops for high school teachers, hoping that these teachers will incorporate this information into their curriculum (four projects). In contrast to the alternative school and employment training approaches, the nature of the service is non-intensive, of short duration, and targeted toward large numbers of youth. Students participated in projects by entering an information center or by attending regular class periods taught by their teacher who attended a project training workshop.

Work Experience. Eight projects have operated on the basis of a work experience strategy where youth performed apprenticeships at worksites. The extent and form of counseling and job-seeking skill training that accompanied the actual work experience varied among projects. Placements included both private sector and the public sector, large bureaucratic organizations, and small owner operated businesses.

I. Characterization of Program Administration

The allocation of responsibilities for program administration to project staff raises three issues with respect to project implementation. The first issue involves program delivery to the youth, i.e., deciding who does what and how. A second issue involves negotiating entry of the program into a system, be it the school or in some cases the school district, and a job site. A third issue involves negotiations with and reporting to Youthwork. The way in which program administration distributes staff responsibilities for these three issues directly influences the implementation of the project. The following section describes how these responsibilities are allocated within each of the four models, and draws conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of different allocation patterns.

Alternative Schools. It appears impossible to separate the administration of career information projects within the three alternative schools from the overall administration of these schools. Narratives of staff meetings, and interviews with teachers lead one to the conclusion that administrative decisions by staff--be they principals or teachers--are made in accord with how the school operates and the particular identity it chooses to carve for itself. Decisions about discipline, teaching styles, and curriculum content stem from the administration and teachers' interpretations of what their approach should be.

Teachers at site 1 (See Table 3) pursued this question throughout the first fiscal year (1978-79) of the school. The principal at one staff meeting added further clarification to the debate by introducing a two page listing of unique characteristics of an alternative school, posing the question about differences between their being or becoming a "mini-traditional school" or a real alternative. A field trip to another alternative school provoked comments by teachers to the on-site observer about startling differences between "us and them". This continuing dialogue among staff indicated a conscious effort to

TABLE 3

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL STUDENTS AT CAREER AWARENESS SITES

Site	Operator	Funded	Number of Students[a] Actual As of 12/79	Projection Fiscal 1980	Actual As of 6/79	Projection Fiscal 1979
1	LEA	10/78	142	150	50	200
2	CONS	10/78	NA	NA	NA	NA
3	NPR	8/78	NA	NA	NA	NA

[a] Number of students was taken from Blackstone MIS Reports (6/14/79 and 12/16/79) when available, and in some cases modified by observer reports.
NA = Not available

keep their school from becoming a place of license for behaviors that caused the students "trouble" at their former school. The assumption among this staff was that a temporary refuge for such behavior would not help them re-enter and succeed in the traditional school. A second assumption was that an alternative school is only a temporary shelter, rather than permanent. Students have and will leave the alternative junior high school to enter the traditional high school. Administrative decisions about what to do with the program for these troubled youth are couched in the two basic assumptions about the ultimate purpose of the alternative school for these youth, and they cannot be considered independently. Emphasis on school success is partially evidenced by this school's yearly report which states that student attendance rates have increased significantly, and their supervision rates have decreased significantly.

The teachers and principal at alternative school site 1 have designed the details of the program to concur with their educational philosophy. Current levels of program staffing would not allow them to create an individualized program for the original projection of

200 students. Therefore, they lowered the target to 150. However, the maximum they still felt they could serve at one time was 50 students. Having the complete support of the prime sponsor, and the district administration, they were able to merge the program with an extended day school, and thereby increase the numbers served at any one time to 100 students, the idea being that they would counsel or be available to these students housed in the same building as the alternative school. Actual school enrollment does not exceed 50 students.

An interesting commonality existed between the alternative schools at sites 2 and 3, each having had one or two staff members funded by project monies. In both cases, the over-all project administration handled financing and monthly reports for the alternative school project staff as well as for other models that operated under the auspices of the project. This assumption of reporting and financing by the larger project administration freed the teachers from these responsbilities, and allowed them time to plan curriculum, formulate goals, and work with students. It also meant that the exemplary project did not help a new alternative school get started, as at site 1, but rather, that project moneis supported additional staff to work with the target group at an alternative school already under way.

One of the teachers supported by the project explained how he did not separate his career information activities from what he did as a teacher in his alternative school:

> He said that he would like the target youth to be able to identify with him and to be able to stay in school. He wants them to stay around long enough so that he can get some career information to them. He said he has had to be extremely careful so that he is not just outright saying: "Hey, we're going to talk

> about careers". He indicates that they just turn off to very straight approaches. He said he had to go through the back door to reach them and so, in essence, his goal was to keep them in school, to keep them in contact, to build a realtionship with them so that he could have some influence in their decision-making relative to jobs and careers. Mentioned as a vehicle to build a relationship with these youth was a back-packing trip that he had just been on the past weekend.

In this instance, the teacher's primary concerns were the needs of the individual youth in his school and how the school responded to them. The project allowed him this freedom to integrate materials and activities to the extent he saw compatible. The manner of his implementing the material had been quite different from that of the other teachers in the same system, especially from those teachers in the four traditional high schools who also received in-service training from the project.

Site 2 has also benefited from the pattern of administration in the same way as the former, only having two staff members and a child care center financed in addition. The services provided for the pregnant women and new teenage mothers relating to career information have taken quite a different character than those provided at centers in three high schools also sponsored by the same project. The staff work within expectations set by the school and the special needs of these youth. The project administrator is viewed by the project staff and director at the alternative school as a mediator who facilitates their task of implementing the program. The director elaborated:

> The project administrator/mediator has helped the job placement person in letter writing and organizing her time better. The job placement person was a very good PR person but needed some guidance from him with her. He is always there when a problem comes up. The high school had had funding problems with various aspects of its program. Specifically, the high school had problems with the equipment for the child care center. They wanted to get good equipment. It was expensive equipment, and he came up with more money through a local city university in getting a grant from them. He seems to, therefore, play the role of a trouble shooter, of a liaison person who helps out with specific problems when asked.

This project administrator/mediator also communicates with CETA, and frees the project staff located at the alternative school from such contact. It is interesting that the principal at site 1 also serves as the mediator. The on-site observer reports:

> She feels in order to "get the job done" it is important to go "straight to the source" so she frequently contacts the prime sponsor directly through phone calls and letters--mostly the latter for clarification and information--so records can be more easily kept. The prime sponsor has been very helpful in explaining, clarifying, and interpreting various guidelines and regulations.

The mediating role assumed by this project director is clearly the most efficient way of handling questions on paperwork for this project as this is a smaller LEA project with one site, working within one school system. She manages the competing demands of her various roles, but also volunteers that separate people in the roles of principals and project director would "make the program more ideal". Sites 2 and 3 are both located in population areas of over 100,000 people, and operate within several school districts.

Employment Training Centers. The two employment training centers run though the community colleges (Table 4, Sites 2 and 3) have been hampered by a time consuming decision-making structure because of the need to involve the colleges in decisions. The resignation of the project director at Site 3 was partly because of this situation. Site 2 college experienced a delayed start-up but succeeded in involving the college when hiring staff and when recruiting peer counselors and students.

TABLE 4

EMPLOYMENT TRAINING STUDENTS AT CAREER AWARENESS SITES

			Number of Students[a]			
Site	Operator	Dates	Actual As of 12/79	Projection Fiscal 1980	Actual As of 6/79	Projection Fiscal 1979
1	CETA	10/78-	13	90	61	330
2	COLL	1/79-	24	500 ← (800)	0	2000
3	COLL	1/79-8/79	-	-	178	200

[a] Number of students was taken from Blackstone MIS Reports (6/14/79 and 12/16/79) when available, and in some cases modified by observer reports.

*Parentheses indicate projection later modified.

Deciding what to do with the students was never considered at the college centers, as that was straightforwardly described in the curriculum packets. However, the curriculum at Site 2 involved 18 time-consuming steps in career awareness where the counselors trained peer counselors who would in turn help train other students. The counselor/trainer staff spent considerable time deciding who would do what, and how that should be decided. This lack of clearly defined roles led to low morale on the part of staff members, as well as change-over during the Fall and Winter of 1979-80 in the position of counselor coordinator.

This changeover consisted in rotating the position among three of the counselor/trainers. Thus, the first type of staff responsabilities, staff roles in service delivery, clearly persisted as a problem. These problems became more visible and perhaps comprehensible as staff expressed concern about being "stretched", the project being understaffed, and indeed taking steps to limit their personal involvement, such as by resignation as counselor coordinator.

Another factor influencing the slow start-up rested in the difficulty identifying CETA eligible youth, i.e., youth under 21 years of age in the proper income category. The on-site observer elaborated on the difficulty in the following memo concerning an adjustment in the income eligibility category:

> The guideline change for peer counselors referred to the fact that the college was using an obsolete income criteria scale. The more current scale from the prime sponsor allowed for a higher family income, thus, potentially qualifying more students since the students applying to the program tended to be in a higher family income bracket than was allowed under the obsolete scale. Meeting the income criteria of CETA is a problem in terms of getting enough eligible students, but it is not the only consideration. Other related problems in this area include age, the number of daytime students available, interest, etc. The 48 others were ineligible for many of the above reasons as well as such reasons as securing employment elsewhere and not meeting training standards. The bottom line of the problem is that the composition of this community college population tends to be over the age of 21.

Thus the second type of staff responsibility, securing entry into the educational system, encounters systemic obstacles outside the realm of staff capabilities to do something about them. The poor fit between the eligibility guidelines of CETA and the actual college population contributed to low enrollment figures. The original plan to provide services to 2000 youth (January 1979) was reduced to 800 in August 1979, and then to 500 in October 1979.

The project director located the major problem of the project in misunderstandings in contract negotiations between Youthwork and the project about planning time. The observer reported this interview with the project director:

> He noted that the main problem evolved from a misperception on the part of DOL, as well as Youthwork, as to where the project was at the time of funding. His opinion was that when DOL/Youthwork funded the original project, Youthwork thought that all the planning had been completed and that the project was ready to be implemented. This, in fact, was not true, because a great deal of additional planning was still needed. In other words, the college submitted the proposal with the intent that it (if funded) would be a developmental project. DOL, however, funded the project with the understanding that the program was already operational.

The project director communicated with Youthwork about implementation problems and readjusted the target numbers. However, the staff shared the anxieties resulting from involvement in a program that Youthwork put on probation in August 1979 because of its failure to be implemented.

Site 1 also encountered difficulty recruiting youth and teachers. The program administration was closely linked to the prime sponsor, as the project staff also worked for CETA, and the program served as a means to implement the philosophy of those offices. The program never gained the full support of the school system, as the latter wanted more control over the service delivery. Thus, the second type of staff responsibility, negotiating entry into the school, impeded full implementation.

In-School Career Awareness Programs. The four reporting in-school career awareness programs have serviced four to twenty traditional high schools each within populated areas of over 500,000 people. All four have attempted to reach youth while they were yet within the school building.

Two projects (sites 5 and 6 in Table 5) have relied primarily on teachers within the schools to deliver the service as part of their classes. The crucial element for project implementation therefore became the identification or recruiting of potential target teachers who could receive training. Once trained, it was assumed that youth in classes where they integrated the career awareness received the service. However, the frequency of in-service teacher workshops and the amount and nature of support services rendered have been quite different.

TABLE 5

IN-SCHOOL CAREER AWARENESS STUDENTS AT CAREER AWARENESS SITES

			Number of Students[a]			
Site	Operator	Dates	Actual As of 12/79	Projection Fiscal 1980	Actual As of 6/79	Projection Fiscal 1979
1	CONS	10/78	223	400	NA	1000
2	CONS	11/78	NA	NA	NA	NA
3	CONS	1/79	36	300	0	800
4[b]	COLL	3/79	4,529	3,125	1,343	1,808
5[c]	NPR	11/78	4,774	←	←	6,000 ←(10,000)
6	NPR	8/78	720	1,500	1,312	1,500

[a] Number of students was taken from Blackstone MIS Reports (6/14/79 and 12/16/79) when available, and in some cases modified by oberserver reports.

[b] Site 4 counted and projected services received for Fiscal 1980 and students for Fiscal 1979.

[c] Site 5 projected 6,000 students for span of project. 10,000 was projection later modified.

NA = Not available

During the school year 1978-79 site 6 had a team of three career information specialists within three of the five high school buildings where the project was implemented. During 1979-80 the project staff was reduced to one member per high school. The support team worked with interested teachers and their classes to help deliver sessions on sex-role stereotyping, job types, etc., that were also presented at teacher/staff training sessions throughout the year for the whole project. Observations of the training sessions and consequent classroom instruction showed that teachers had much flexibility in how they used the training sessions. Some teachers opted for the support team to present the sessions to their class. Others presented it themselves.

Site 5 recruited 51 teachers from twenty high schools and six middle schools to two days of training sessions in August, the start of the project's second year. Here the project staff presented the curriculum packets they sponsored. One project staff member had responsibility for continued contact with the teachers, which included distributing the curriculum materials and delivering the pre- and post tests. This project encountered start-up problems when entering the schools the first year, especially in negotiating the training time of teachers and the collection of confidential data about the students using the Blackstone forms. It appeared from reports of early negotiations that project staff had to spend unanticipated time and energy in order to comply with regulations and procedures of the school system. Adjustments were made to relieve the problems of confidentiality and the use of substitute teachers. Arrangements were worked out school by school to satisfy the requirements of different headmasters. The result was greater variety in the implementation of the program than originally anticipated. The implementation of the curriculum was also strongly influenced by the existing organizational structures of the high schools, i.e., class schedules, class content, and teacher load, as well as by the instructional skills and dedication of the different teachers. This latter issue of variation in quality is addressed in greater detail in section IV, "Staff/Student Relationships", of this chapter.

Sites 3 and 4 have employed their own staff to deliver the career information in the schools. The project director of site 4 was located at a community college and one career specialist was located at each of five high schools. During the first year the specialists received little program direction as the director found himself tackling the many paperwork and reporting tasks for the project. Several specialists reported at that time that they took initiative and formed their own directions. During the Fall of 1979 the project director found more time to deal with program format, but some specialists had already established programs and were into the rhythm of their particular schools. The following account describes the dilemma experienced by a specialist who tried to integrate her program into the life of a school, yet found such behavior in conflict with the organizational needs of the overall project.

> I arrived and as we (on-site observer and project director) started to talk the phone rang. It was the specialist from one of the high schools who was calling to tell the project director that she could not attend a staff meeting scheduled for that afternoon. The project director was visibly angry, reminding the specialist that the meeting had been arranged a while ago and part of her responsibility was to report back to these staff meetings so that some degree of coordination could be effected. The specialist had, however, scheduled a school activity for that day and could not postpone that activity (administration of career awareness inventory tests) to come to the meeting.
>
> After hanging up, he explained that one thing he had learned was that this arrangement of coordinating 5 specialists out in the schools and who had divided loyalties to the college and to the high

> schools was not an effective way to provide services. "Next time, I will let the schools supervise them and we will just have a liaison coordination arrangement."

The administration of in-school career awareness programs is strongly affected by the fact that the programs run within schools. Program deliverers, be they non-school personnel as in the preceding case or current teachers, are bounded in what they could do because of the organizational context, i.e., the school.

Site 3 has not implemented the in-school career awareness component for the proposed 100 high school and 200 community college students. The work experience strategy intends to combine the classroom instruction of this strategy with a job experience for 91 high school students and nine students from the college. The administrative structure is addressed in the following work experience section of this report.

Work Experience. The eight work experience programs have attempted to provide career information along with an on-the-job experience for under 100 youth. Table 6 summarized information concerning project start-up dates and the numbers of students who have received or are receiving work experience at these eight sites.

Five sites reached (or nearly so) their projected student population. (Protocol data from site 1 does not explain program administration sufficiently to include the site in a discussion here.) Site 6 revised its original proposal in the Fall of 1978 to expand its services to a small 100 student work experience project in addition to the in-school career awareness component already proposed and approved. This necessitated that the project act quickly to formulate plans which it did, as the work experience component took place for the 100 students in the Spring of 1979.

TABLE 6

WORK EXPERIENCE STUDENTS AT CAREER AWARENESS SITES

			Number of Students[a]			
Site	Operator	Dates	Actual As of 12/79	Projection Fiscal 1980	Actual As of 6/79	Projection Fiscal 1979
1	LEA	10/78-6/79	NA	NA	232	240
2	CONS	11/78-2/80	39	90	NA	NA
3	CONS	1/79	29	100	0	120 ← (240)
4	NPR	11/78	11	20	8	20
5	NPR	10/78	85	100	59	50
6	NPR	8/78	80	80	100	100
7	NPR	4/79	6	60	-	-
8	NPR	6/79	21	15	-	-

[a] Number of students was taken from Blackstone MIS Reports (6/14/79 and 12/16/79) when available, and in some cases modified by observer reports. Parentheses indicate projection later modified.

Site #6 has operated in five high schools with a staff of three persons in each school. These career information specialists constitute a Support Team for the in-school career awareness component in the schools. Recruiting for the work experience component took place in career awareness classes. For the work experience component the specialists conducted student training sessions before and during the work experience. Staff from the project administration offices of the non-profit organization developed the job sites. They also served as a liaison between the student and the high school support specialists by making site visits. In addition, they developed a manual that served as the basis for the curriculum used in training sessions by the support specialists. A picture of role clarity begins to evolve when describing the program administration at this site. People were able to depend on others to contribute to the total workings of the project. An examination of two situations that may have impeded the project implementation further our understanding of the key dynamic that role clarity played.

First, the project was not funded in August 1978 as expected. The project administrators insisted upon the importance of synchronizing the project start-up date with that of the school year and supplied their own organization's funds to begin the in-school career awareness component. They operated for two months in good faith that Youthwork would respond. They also complied with the request to draft a work experience component, skirting further negotiations in part, I would speculate, because it was an exciting opportunity for them, and they also had a substantial initial investment already made in the in-school component. Just as the in-school component built upon their previous career information projects operating for the last few years in the school district, it also served as a point of departure for developing work experience based in the schools. Thus what for some organizations may have been unmanageable problems from the federal government and Youthwork, that is, delayed starts, delayed funding, and seemingly unending contract negotiations, was for this parent organization the routine in which much of their time was spent.

The second example addresses role clarity of program staff regarding service delivery to youth. Two support teachers were interviewed by the on-site observer and shared their opinions about the role of work site liaison.

> Support Teacher #1. The supervisors at work did not want to deal with the problems that came up; they thought we should do it and so they would tell the two liaisons and the two liaisons would tell us, and we would deal with the student. If I only had the job of vocational education coordinator, then I would deal with the situation right when it arose on the job. That was a problem that I had with this.
>
> We were too far removed. We were there as a support system but were too far removed. And I would have liked to have been right in there when things were happening and not get the message two days later and track down the kid. I would like to go get in my car and go right out there and you know, talk about it right there.
>
> Support Teacher #2. I am not sure how I feel about that because I think it is difficult to go out and get the job, find the job sites, and sell the employers and then still be the student's advocate. The communication would be a whole lot easier, but structurally, it would be much simpler, a much stronger hold on it, but I really feel it would be more difficult, on one hand, to have sold the employer into taking a student and then still be the student's advocate. I found that both school liaisons, almost out of necessity, had to take the employer's side in any of the small things that came up because they would come back and tell us, listen we got these job sites, we promised this, this, and this. It is your job to make sure that the kids perform.

This discussion illustrates alternative staffing structures that the program might have chosen, but instead a course was set by the parent organization at the beginning and staff complied with the master plan. Other interviews also demonstrate a healthy awareness of program options in staff responsibilities, in particular with that of the job developer. However, while the conversation acknowledges the alternatives, the support teachers also knew that the project had a set goal (so many job slots in the public sector by a certain deadline). They thus proceeded accordingly, realizing that the present method of program administration was but one among several alternatives. Aceepting the planned roles allowed an efficient implementation at the expense of the participation of the support team in overall program design.

The trade off of efficiency versus participation in program design explains the difficulty another work experience project (Site 7) experienced in project implementation. Staff hired to instruct and supervise placements for youth on an Indian reservation had a skeleton plan from which to work. Problems arose concerning the relevance of work for these youth, and how to create strategies for increasing their motivation. During this process new roles for staff and a new program design emerged, that would create two types of work experience responsive to students with different degrees of motivation and commitment to learning. This process of recasting the program took almost a year, and saw the resignation of the first set of service deliverers. The project continued to have the support of the reservation and the school district because of their belief that youth unemployment was a grave problem to which they had no solution, but were willing to support another group that might create solutions.

Another project (Site 5) created a unique solution to communication problems between the exemplary project staff and training center staff. Project staff entered a sheltered workshop as a team so that similar but separate services could be extended to the CETA eligible youth, a new population of the training center. Initial months of parallel delivery caused organizational conflict over training center norms and expectations. As a resolution, exemplary project staff members joined the regular staff on equal service delivery lines. This meant that rather than create separate but equal services for the CETA youth, the capacity of existing staff to work with this new population was strengthened by the addition of exemplary project staff.

This example of linking the exemplary project service delivery roles closely to existing roles in an organization lessened the competition among staff members, as well as increased understanding as well as the ability of those staff members to provide services for the new target group. The stage has also been set for the sheltered workshop staff to continue integrating this group into its program after project monies are depleted.

Work experience site #3 offers an interesting contrast to site #6. After twelve months of funding, the site had placed seventeen high school students at work experience sites. The original projected total of 240 placements was lowered in late summer, 1979, to 91 high school students and 9 college students. The three issues in program administration, i.e., negotiations with Youthwork, role clarity in program delivery to youth, and program entry into the educational systems, have all impeded program implementation. The foremost problems have rested in the fact that the program has been operated by two bureaucracies--a school system and a community college, and subjected to input from a third bureaucracy, the local CETA administration. The on-site observer explains this arrangement:

> There is no simple way of summarizing program administration. One might as well face the complicated situation that deals with at least two or more bureaucracies.
>
> From an operational standpoint, the two program coordinators share the focus of decision making, at least decision recommendations. While they are delegated some decision-making authorities, these are not too well defined. For example, each coordinator has a relation to one higher in the authority chain. The board of education coordinator reports to a project director of the career center, who, in turn, refers

> to an administrator at the Board on many matters (budget modifications, staffing, etc.). The college coordinator relates to a dean of the college, who, in turn, frequently must refer to the college president. The board of education project director and the college dean confer on operational decisions, as required.
>
> The coordinators confer (and meet) regularly regarding operational matters (and related decisions), but it is not clear that many significant decisions can be made without consulting a higher authority. There is an advisory committee but it is of such a nature that, at this time, it cannot really make decisions for the program, only hear and discuss situations and make recommendations for actions.
>
> Each of the major program administrators have some unique decision-making responsibilities that are either defined by the proposal or have been assumed. The board of education makes decisions regarding the job development activities, and student-related matters (high school placements, selection of high schools, and liaison personnel within the high schools, the type of interest surveys that will be given to students, and the type of site monitoring that will take place).
>
> The college component makes decisions relative to the selection and training of the peer counselors, their school assignments and work schedules, the methods to be used in providing workshops for college students, and the selection of resource materials for translation and field use.

Each of the coordinators at the board of education and the college has a project staff. The board coordinator has two part-time job developers, and one secretary. The college coordinator has one guidance counselor full time, and one program specialist.

The coordination problems experienced when trying to bring the college peer counselors together with the high school work experience students illustrated the almost impossible demands that had to be covered before starting the project. The board of education had 200 student applications processed for work slots in spring, 1979. However, the college had not yet trained the peer counselors for counseling these students during their work. Over the summer, peer counselors were paid, not for use in counseling the high school students for the Youthwork project, but rather for work on a program for the college. The project was consequently placed on probation. In the fall 1979 the on-site observer reported many different decision-making steps involving placement of peer counselors in the high schools. Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) argue that multiple decision-making steps and participants in the decision-making process increase the likelihood that a program will not be implemented.

The stages of decision making about peer counselor roles at site 3 included discussions by the board of education and the department of employment about qualification of the 15 peer counselors, both academic and financial, the department of employment fearing that high academic requirements would eliminate most applicants from CETA eligibility; college student inquiries into the minority representation of the peer counselors; coordination of peer counselor schedules with those of the college counselor, the board of education coordinator, and the school liaison person; evolution of peer counselor role from counseling high school students in career plans, toward sporadic counseling and filing applications. Finally, it was decided that their major initial responsibilities would be recruitment of high school students and in-take. Upon completion of in-take work in January or February, it was agreed that the peer counselors would work with students as originally planned. Seven peer counselors were scheduled to have met with school liaisons in mid-December. In addition, the college program staff faced possible relocation of the project on college grounds to trailers, financial strains because the department of employment had not approved the modified budget so that staff and peer counselors would not be paid before Christmas, and decreasing morale. Meanwhile 17 work experience students were at their job sites without peer counselor contact.

The unanticipated number of decisions that had to be made surrounding this particular unique feature of this project, the peer counselors, added to the array of individuals with input into the decision-making process. The result was the multiple decision-making steps hindered project implementation from being efficient and effective (cf. Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973, for a similar situation).

Site #2 used a substantially different administrative structure than the other projects. Here school administrators and counselors located placements for students in the community, and the community people contracted to give the students an apprenticeship, which included instruction at some work sites. However, this site found itself having difficulty with the reporting requirements set by Youthwork, and slow receipt of funding. Five other work experience sites reported problems in meeting Youthwork requests. As already mentioned in the case of site #6, these people are committed to the idea that what they have to offer is good for their potential clients. The strength of their ideology, be it belief in combating sex-role stereotyping, employing Indians, fighting urban drugs and illegal money, sometimes persuades them to deal with the tensions ensuing from the federal connection. The problems raise questions about what projects secure federal funding, at what expense and what projects are eliminated because potential sponsoring organization cannot cope with federal funding practices.

II. Structures for Youth Involvement in Program Operation

Structure for youth involvement in program operation of career awareness projects include peer counselors at six projects. These six sites have grappled with the concept of youth participation in the recruting, clerical work, advising and counseling, and training at the projects, some developing more understanding about what contributions youth can and cannot make toward their projects. Table 7 charts the program responsibilities assumed by peer counselors at these six sites.

TABLE 7

PEER COUNSELORS AT CAREER AWARENESS SITES

		Organization			Responsibilities		
Site	Operator	Class	Informal	Paid	Train	Recruit/ Intake[a]	Counsel
1	NPR		x				x
2	LEA	x					x
3	COLL	x		x	x	ⓧ	x
4	COLL		x	x	x	ⓧ	x
5	CONS	x		x	x	ⓧ	x
6	CETA	x		x	x		

[a] Circles indicate current priorities.

Peer counselors at site 1 are not formally organized into a group, but serve in that role upon request of the staff. The observer reports:

> Peers are used as counselors in specific situations only. If a participant displays a negative attitude toward the project or center during evaluation, participants in training are used to discuss their experiences with the reluctant client. In this situation peers have more strength in terms of credibility and rapport than "professional" counselors.

This statement raises the sometimes ambivalent assumption that reoccurs at the other five sites with peer counselors, that peer influence is an effective strategy for confronting problem youth in some instances. The type of problems confronted are not elaborated upon above, but the observations, interviews, and staff reflections at the other five sites may help us better differentiate possible roles for youth as peer counselors.

An on-site observer interviewed one youth at site 2, an alternative school:

> I asked if she felt she had an opportunity to let suggestions be known. She said yes, mostly through "peer counseling". She was one of eight who were chosen for this group which meets twice a week with the guidance counselor. Being in this group seems to give her a sense of pride and responsibility. "We help the other kids who have problems and let them know we all have to help each other."

The newsletter of the school describes the class in the following article written by the guidance counselor:

> The classroom can be a lonely threatening place for many students. Some students go from day to day without having any personally satisfying experiences with other students. The purpose of peer counseling is to train selected students in counseling techniques so they will be able to communicate with their fellow classmates positively. It provides an opportunity for students to get to know each other, and to create a positive environment where students develop a feeling of belonging. Two forty minute classes are scheduled weekly in which our student counselors are trained in activities that encourage openness, sharing, social awareness, and personal growth. We will begin our training with a course in sociology for the first nine weeks. The second nine weeks we will concentrate on psychology and counseling techniques the student counselors will use when working with their peers.

In addition to help students relate "positively" to fellow classmates, the class emphasizes personal growth of the youth to be counselors. This intent may be due to the younger age of the junior high school students, but also to the awareness of staff that the class is a vehicle for developing goals of openness, sharing, social awareness, and personal growth.

The other four projects have attempted to employ peer counselors as part of their project staff after training sessions that varied from a half day to forty hours. These peer counselors worked in the employment training, in-school career awareness, and work experience models.

Training of the peer counselors focussed on self-awareness of their own career goals at three sites. Site 3 used the same curriculum for the peer counselors that they hoped they would in turn help the new project enrollees complete. When the site encountered difficulty recruiting students, training of peer counselors shifted to include self-presentation and marketing techniques so that they could help recruit new enrollees.

This group of counselors also worked in the office and "counseled" students referred by teachers. The on-site observer spoke with one peer counselor during a visit:

> I spent about an hour talking to one of the peer counselors who started in the first group of peers. He thinks the program is great but expresses apprehension about what will happen to the students when the project terminates. He said he had already been instrumental in keeping several students in school because of his guidance. He thought the early alert effort, where teachers notify the center of students with problems, was working fine. He speaks with enthusiasm and pride as he talks about the program. He, no doubt, is a shining star in the program.

Site 6 trained students in group techniques and strategies that they used in training groups in self-awareness. Site 5 presented topics for discussion such as "Career Goals". This included definitions of goals, careers, work decision-making, and two slide/tape presentations followed by discussion. The on-site observer commented:

> The peer counselors' training program seems to be directed at their own learning, but this may be the best way to prepare them for work with high school students. It seems unusual, however, that in the two training sessions that have been observed there has been no reference to the utilization of the information in their contact with students in the high schools.

These peer counselors would be used initially in recruiting and in-take work in the high schools. However, this was decided toward the end of their training sessions, after considerable discussion about their eligibility, both financial and academic.

The peer counselor college students at site 5 would spend limited time in the buildings where the high school students would be located. This posed logistical problems in terms of scheduling meetings between the work experience students, the liaison staff at the high school, the guidance counselors, and the peer counselors from the college. The observer reported this discussion with the coordinators from the board of education about how the time problem was to be resolved:

> In an attempt to resolve this problem, the school board coordinator will develop time schedules when students can be available in the schools and the college staff will attempt to develop schedules for the peer counselors to match the students' scheduled. This now poses a difficult time problem, both with respect to finding a period when the student will be free and in allowing the peer

> counselor as much as two hours for travel for a one hour meeting with a student. All this assumes that the peer counselors can meet with the students in the absence of the school liaison person, who, presumably, will arrange for the interfacing.

It is reasonable that introductions would have to be made when the peer counselors first meet with the students, but the lack of familiarity with the setting and distance between the "home bases" of the high school students and the peer counselors has limited the possibility of frequent, and perhaps necessary impromptu contact or spontaneous contact at moments when it is felt necessary. The frequency and scheduled interactions made the contact of a different sort than that already described by the peer counselors in the college center above. A further problem was that the high school students were located in several schools through a large section of the district.

Descriptions of the peer counselors by the on-site coordinator provide insight into what these youth have hoped to accomplish:

> Mark is a large, talkative (gabby) and confident black man, a graduate of a district high school and one of the college students who had contacted the college office asking to be involved in the program. He claims to have worked with students while he was in high school and he has continued to keep contact with the high school and its students. He will be assigned to a different high school and is looking forward to the opportunity of working with students of that school. It is expected that in spite of some brashness he will relate very well to many of these students. One problem that may be encountered is that these students are vocationally oriented, and he does not have much of a feeling for this kind of a program. However, the needs of the students will likely go beyond their specific vocational interests and they will therefore be supported by interfacing with the college student. He made it quite clear that he feels that a high school diploma is not enough to insure that a minority student will succeed. He thinks that post-secondary work is required and I am sure that this will be a dominant theme in his interfacing with the high school students.

Mark will approach high school with his own assumptions about formulating career plans and success in life. It does not appear that the training for peer counselors will affect how he approaches his work at the high school, nor that it will define his skills, or make him aware of his values. It does appear that the "counseling" opportunity will provide a chance for him to work with students in an official role, and pay him for what he enjoys doing, and seems capable of doing.

At site 4 the peer "counselors" were renamed peer "advisors" and finally peer "aides". Their work was to complete and file in-take forms. They also assisted students who entered the career center for the first time. Training for these advisors came after they had already started work. The observer report about the second training session for five peer counselors illustrates that part of the training problem was that no one was clear about what type of leadership responsibilities the peer counselors should be prepared to assume. Also, college and high school staff were uncertain about what the peer counselors could do.

> The counselor then spent some considerable time differentiating between advise and counsel. The former is given from one's own background, the latter from the perspective of the person you are listening to and trying to help. As a biased observer, I found it hard to think that high school students of this limited persipacity could ever be able to handle the distinction, not to mention carrying it out in practice. One kid then complained that every printed information brochure she saw would also glamorize the job and say that there was a need, "even if there wasn't". The paraprofessional agreed that there was a need for more realistic appraisals of job opportunities, as which point the girl who made the comment got into an argument with another person and stormed out of the room. The counselor then switched to role-playing exercises, based on his working hypothesis that other students would come to the peer advisors rather than school counselors because it's easier to relate to one's peers. He has them take turns being a student as a peer advisor, but it was not a very constructive use of the time. The kids were not too eager and

> really didn't have proper background in issues, problems, reference resources and materials to be able to hold an intelligent role play.

The training session demonstrated the limitations in the concept of the peer advisor program, and the lack of responsiveness of the students to the presentation. However, it may be that the concept was not clearly developed, and that as noted by the observer during the observation, the peers needed training in concrete advising techniques and role clarity.

The project on-site observer further reported on the project decision to use the counselors as "aides" rather than "advisors".

> The peer advisor component of our project has not worked out, for a number of reasons. The primary reason is that the project requirement that only economically disadvantaged students be eligible limited, in the eyes of the project staff, the quality of the role of the peer advisor for the project. A basic necessity for this component is motivated people who are interested in learning and related to others. With this eligibility requirement, participants were not necessarily motivated. In addition, as they were economically disadvantaged they were also to some large extent educationally disadvantaged and not receptive to put in the learning effort (reading and writing) needed to serve as advisors. A necessary preliminary to any "peer counselor" program is a "peer leadership" program that will develop attitudes on what to counsel helpfully one's peers. A basic deficiency of four peer advisor programs was our failure to grapple with what we meant by advisor. Some of our specialists thought the students were indeed to counsel, some thought they weren't qualified (the latter won out and our advisors are now called aides). The lack of student quality and the lack of concept hindered development of a successful peer program.

A seventh site had nine students involved in a youth steering committee that used the materials also distributed to target teachers in the high schools. The instructor reported that it had taken considerable time to decide how to make best use of this group. She reported:

> Originally Youthwork really wanted them to have a kind of involvement that demands expertise, or at least that is my impression. The only way they could have hoped to get that expertise would have been in a highly intensified exposure to the materials and process. The project time line made it impossible to involve them in the initial materials development anyway.

The instructor encouraged reactions to the materials. She described to the on-site observer her perceptions of youth and teacher in-put into curriculum modifications:

> We found that they could give reactions but not solutions. Teachers mostly were also better at identifying problems than solving them, but that is as it should be. We are the experts. We are supposed to know how to solve the problems.

Thus student participation in program operation of this program operation of this program involves helping identify areas in the curriculum materials that need revision. Revision included sequencing, additional topics, format, and notes for the teachers based on student comments.

III. Academic Credit for Work Experience.

Career Awareness projects offered in some instances credit for program participation, which was not necessarily work experience.

Alternative Schools. Classes in all three alternative schools lead toward diplomas. The curriculum at the junior high alternative included components of career awareness in many facets of the curriculum, including math and physical education.

Employment Training Centers. No employment training centers offered credit for program participation.

In-School Career Awareness. Career awareness classes at two programs operated during academic class time, thereby constituting a part of the academic curriculum in some sense. One of these projects provided a four week curriculum unit that teachers at one school used in their English classes. The target teachers in the other project integrated career related topics into their classes. Topics included sex-role stereotyping, and job preferences. These teachers also invited members of a career support team to conduct special sessions with their students.

Work Experience. The Blackstone MIS data (12/16/79) did not report any career awareness sites as granting academic credit for work experience. However, on-site observers reported academic credit at one site and attendance credit at two others. As stated in their teacher training manual, work experience site #6 awarded academic credit for work experience. This was done if the student completed the program and also fulfilled his/her contract with the teacher which may have included either a written report or an oral presentation about the work experience. It was not clear that this work experience could take the place of attendance in class or other class obligations. At another project one school agreed to give two academic credit points to two students, granted primarily on the basis of the time that students spent in the program. A second school related to the same project refused to grant one student credit because that school has a policy of not granting credit for out of school activities.

The observer at a third work experience site reported that negotiations were underway to provide academic credit for both career exploration and for an in-depth apprenticeship. The project's proposal left considerable ambiguity about the mechanics of how to operationalize the academic credit for work experience idea. Thus it was taking the project staff time to weigh the alternatives, even though the school system supported the idea of credit for program participation.

The on-site observer at a fourth work experience site reported:

> Students from one school system receive one credit per semester, and this is a work study credit. The 14 and 15 year old participants, the credit is either through vocational educational curricula of the school, or for others through their vocational laboratory class. Students from the second school system receive two credits per semester.

The description of academic credit for work experience at the work experience sites indicates little support on the part of most related educational institutions for academic credit. Two school systems gave support, yet only one school system and project have actually established a formal mechanism whereby the credit for work experience moves with accepted procedures through the system. In this case the actual contract negotiation took place between the student, the academic teacher, and the work experience support team.

IV. Staff/Student Relationships

The alternative school, in-school career awareness, and work experience models contain organizational structures that of themselves shape staff/student contact and, as a consequence, the nature of the resultant relationships.

Alternative Schools. Students are at the alternative schools all day. They interact with the staff at this location in formal and informal ways--in class, in the halls, lounges, and in the lunchroom.

Youth interviews in Interim Report #2 indicated that youth used descriptions like "understanding", "caring", and "helping", for staff members at their alternative schools. They also stressed that these people were unlike staff at their former schools. The close relationships were engendered by 1) the physical proximity, 2) smallness of setting and 3) shared purposes of schooling. These factors, taken together, have lead to programs that are tailored to the needs of the particular students, e.g., backpacking trips, a fall festival, counseling over lunch, or following through on performance expectations in class. In the alternative settings, the teachers have the luxury of taking the time to care and the freedom to construe a curriculum responsive to the special needs of the students.

In-School Career Awareness. Staff at the in-school awareness sites who deliver the program services to the students are high school teachers or career specialists brought into the schools for project delivery. Information about program delivery at three projects indicates that staff/student relations within this model are also strongly affected by the organizational structure of the high school. Key factors include 1) pre-established curriculum, 2) class size, 3) school schedule, and 4) physical space. Even though target teachers are attempting to infuse the project ideas or curriculum into their classes, they are still working within a setting where schedules are already set by the school and where the numbers of students is determined by enrollment in normal classes.

Scheduling of students was a continuing constraint on one project seeking to reach students through career centers established in the high schools. The on-site observer noted:

> The major constraint in our project, in delivering services in a formalized environment--the actual setting of a high school, not a greenhouse setting set apart from the hustle of the real world--is that of meshing with the unit's schedule. And articulation with the schedule was a major limitation to our access to students, to the length of time he could devote in the center, to the time he could come to the center, and to the types of activities that he could do in the center.

The paraprofessionals working in the center with the peer advisors concurred in this frustration. One concluded:

> If the youth whom the peer counselors are supposed to help are away at home after school when the peer counselors can work, what are the peer counselors supposed to do? They have nothing to do.

Two projects that set as their goals to reach over 1,000 students during a school year were able to do so by using regular classes as a vehicle for dissminating the career information. The staff/student relationships within those classes were influenced by numbers present, the schedule, the curriculum used, and the instructional style of the teacher. Observations of classroom instruction indicated a wide range in teaching styles. One class session on decision-making succeeded in engaging the students in defining a problem concerning a fictitious student peer, and then in deciding what to do about it. One support teacher from the career team was leading a target teacher's class with whom she had already worked several times.

> She had an empty chair in the front of the room with a sketched face named Joan on the front and she said, "Joan is 17 years old and I want you to brainstorm and say what does this hypothetical Joan have to face next year".

And so the students began. There was a good bit of laughter and joking among them. They listed the following: Courses to take, diet, pregnancy, job, whether she's going to get married, whether she's going to move out, whether she's going to move in with her boyfriend, whether she's going to use birth control, whether she's going to travel, whether she's going to drop out of school, what she's going to do when she graduates, whether she will use drugs or alcohol, whether she's going to engage in premarital sex.

The support teacher very good naturedly clarified each of these and accepted everyone that the students indicated. She then said she was going to divide them into four groups of six to slect an issue. She said she wanted them in their group and they only had four minutes to decide on an issue that they wanted Joan to face, to identify one other character in addition to Joan, to define the situation, and to identify the time and place.

Each group with a bit of prompting from her then sat for four minutes and came up with answers to each of these prompts. From each of the group it went as follows: The first group said sex; the second group said pregnancy; the third group said marriage and/or pregnancy; and the fourth group said sex. It was pretty clear what the students had on their minds this morning!

The support teacher said: "OKay, I want you to vote on one of these then." So, they decided the issue would be pregnancy and whether or not to follow through with marriage.

The support teacher then asked for three volunteers to act as the character described in this particular issue and that was Ralph, her boyfriend. She had three volunteers act as Ralph and three volunteers act as Joan.

Each of these groups of three sat behind the chair of the respective person and they role played for four minutes; they discussed the issue with a good bit of prompting from the support teacher. There was a lot of laughter and a lot of smart remarks, jabbing, and poling. Some of it I really couldn't hear being on the periphery and the support teacher couldn't hear it all either. She commented a couple of times, "Hey, make sure that you say it so that we can all hear it."

> After the discussion was over, the support teacher said: 'You know there was a lot of laughing going on here. That could mean several things. Many times when an issue is very close to you, sometimes you laught. That is one way people deal with it."
>
> So, she asked, "What could the laughter have meant this morning?" And I thought, very nicely, one student said, "Fear". And then she elaborated that a little bit, talking about that it may have been something that they in fact had experienced themselves before or knew someone who had.
>
> She said, "Alright. Let's list the alternatives that were mentioned in this discussion". The alternatives included such things as abortion, adoption, marriage, getting support from an outside agency, the girl dropping out of school. She then prodded them to hurry along and list some consequences for each of the alternatives. For abortion, one of the consequences was shame; for adoption, it was hard on the girl; for marriage, they'd need child support, welfare, parents rejection--these were some of the consequences associated with them. She indicated that the object of a good decision was that it needs to be satisfactory to both persons involved.

The class was lively, enthusiastic, and responsive to the interchange in small groups, and role playing in large groups. The support teacher--a member of the career guidance support team with a counseling background--summarized, directed activities as different stages, and asked questions that helped the students think about the topic further.

The following observation at another project demonstrates a quite different teaching style. The setting is a high school classroom in which the teacher is using workbooks from a curriculum packet distributed by the project.

> The teacher admonished one student who was working ahead in the workbook: "You have to stay right with us, you cannot forge ahead like that. These questions are not as simple as they look."

> The teacher mentioned to me (on-site observer) the he/she had problems with students who wanted to forge ahead and who then misunderstood the materials.
>
> "What is the correct posture for an interview?" the teacher asked. "Well it is not the way you sit in the classroom!" Each time he asked students to fill in a question in the workbook, he went around to students who needed help. The class moved slowly with very little whole class interaction.

The contrasting teaching styles illustrated in the two observations above support the contention that introducing a new curriculum package does not necessarily mean that teachers will teach differently, or change habits or modes of interacting with youth. Sarason (1971) in The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change documented this process when reviewing the failure of the new math to be implemented in schools.

Work Experience. Students at the work experience projects have interacted with adults in multiple roles. Table 8 shows that youth in all projects worked with supervisors who oversaw this work at the job sites. Six projects have had staff who conducted pre-employment training sessions or workshops on topics such as self-awareness, job-seeking skills and communication exercises. Two sites employed a liaison person who served as the mediator between the work site supervisor and school personnel. At two sites adults developed the jobs and then placed the students. Three sites used a coordinator to work with students as recruiters, or counselors.

TABLE 8

STAFF ROLES VIS-A-VIS WORK EXPERIENCE STUDENTS

Sites	Coordinator	Trainer	Liaison	Job Developer	Supervisor
1		x		x	x
2				x	x
3	x	x		x	x
4		x			x
5		x			x
6		x	x	x	x
7		x	x	x	x
8		x			x

Interviews with students in Interim Report #2 indicated they perceived on-site supervisors and trainers as especially helpful in three programs. One student who was placed in a police department described his/her trainer in this way:

> They went out of their way to help us; for example, to get a job, to get where we wanted to be. They helped us with problems; like if we had trouble getting to work. They also said they were available to talk about any problems we had, whether or not they were on-the-job problems, we were encouraged to feel free to come in and talk.

The openness and reaching out of the trainers who had the time and primary responsibility to work with the youth created a context for learning for the 100 youth placed in this program. The student quoted above said that her particular job as file clerk in a police office was not what she wanted, but it helped her make up her mind about other aspects of police work she might find more interesting. She saw her duties as a file clerk as but one aspect of a large learning experience. This site provided training sessions at the school that coincided with the two month placement, thus giving a formal setting where the work experience might also be discussed. These role performances of counseling and training assumed by the site supervisors and trainers enable the work experience to be a fitting learning experience for the youth. This importance seems to argue for structural assurances in program design that such opportunities for adult student interactions occur, rather than leaving them to chance.

A student at a different site without training or counseling expressed satisfaction with the availability of adult contact:

> I talk to the coordinator often and he told me that if I had any problems here or in school to come to him. I don't have any problem in talking with these people. They make me feel that they are easy to talk to and that they are interested in me. If I had something to say about my work, how to do it better or something like that, they would listen to me.

Two sites have employed liaisons to improve contact between the placement and the training staff. One site considered integrating some job duties of the liaison with those of the trainer to increase continuity in student relations with the adults. It should be noted that this is a small project proposing 60 students at a maximum. Trainers at the other site have discussed the pros and cons of having students relate to so many adults, in section 1 of this report. What remains clear, however, is that the trainers and students feel that contact with students during the work experience has an important value. Whether that contact be through the on-site supervisor, a trainer, or a liaison person depends upon the local project's staffing possibilities.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Characterization of Program Administration

Alternative School.

The organizing principles for the alternative schools are based upon their identity as an alternative school, rather than their identity as a career program. The career awareness programs fit into the alternative schools and are adapted to fit into the schools' special character. This present report, Interim Report #2 (1979) and Graham's speech to the vice presidents task force on youth unemployment (1979) have all emphasized the importance and success of the alternative schools as settings for school-to-work transition programs. The alternative schools should be encouraged to continue to operate as they do, that is, as alternative schools, rather than as schools created to follow a particular career awareness strategy. Their overall success with "hard to reach" youth, especially in terms of basic skill instruction and pre-employment training, merits further study and exploration.

Recommendations for DOL

(1) Alternative schools should be considered as a prime vehicle through which to explore the providing of basic skills and career awareness to "hard to reach" youth.

(2) The specific alternative schools should be allowed to develop the career awareness component to achieve congruity with the developing philosophy of the school. One staff member directly responsible for career awareness at the school site opens possibilities for developing that component.

(3) The alternative schools should encourage organizational structures that promote input and leadership of all staff members in the curriculum and program development.

(4) Reporting requirements remain a burden, especially for projects that do not have the administrative support of a larger parent organization that operates several project sites, and thus assumes paperwork for all sites. DOL should waiver reporting requirements to some degree for small sites.

Employment Training Centers

Programs at employment training centers were either not fully implemented or experienced serious losses in personnel. The two college employment training centers had to clear project plans with the college administration, and this process caused a time consuming decision-making process. The director at one college site resigned. At the second college site, the lengthy decision-making process coupled with unclear staff roles, a complicated 18-step curriculum plan, and difficulty recruiting students under 21 years of age, meant that the college did not fully implement its program. The third project was located in a school system which was also unsupportive. The result was limited contact and difficulty in recruiting students.

Recommendation for DOL

Employment training centers need to establish clear lines of authority vis-a-vis the college or school administration regarding the nature of the relationship and access to students.

Recommendation for Youthwork

Technical assistants should conduct post project reviews in those instances where programs were not implemented or where projects did not come close to serving the projected number of students. These reviews may suggest a need for more explicit role definitions, staff accountability, model simplification, and assessment of the availability of the target group.

In-School Career Awareness Programs.

This model has operated within high schools. The approach relies on teachers and their classes or project staff based in the buildings. The projects have all been strongly influenced by the administrative structure of the respective high schools. Some degree of administrative restructuring on the part of the school is required to insure building space, sufficient staffing, and the scheduling of students to work with the project. Several sites have shown that these issues were resolved only over an extended period of time. Sufficient technical assistance could accellerate the restructuring necessary for program implementation.

Recommendations to Youthwork

(1) Technical assistance is necessary to help staff avoid and/or solve problems ensuing from potential role conflict and communication needs rising throughout the first and second years of a project.

(2) Project administration should strive for a clear organizational form. Each of the project staff located in schools should report to a director,

principle, or teacher within the school. This is necessary if the project is to become organizationally an integral part of the schools. One immediate consequence would be to reduce role conflicts.

(3) In-school programs need to receive funding contracts before the school year begins in order for the schools to incorporate the program into the students' schedule for the year, to employ staff, to secure facilities, and to provide time for planning for implementation.

Work Experience: Negotiations with and reporting to Youthwork.

Two programs, one supported by a parent organization and the other run by a staff highly committed to what they are doing, were able to maintain program continuity and integrity through delayed funding and protracted negotiations over contracts. Three projects did not have one or both of those supports and as a result, their efforts were seriously jeopardized by difficulties in contract negotiations as well as in meeting reporting requirements.

Recommendation for Youthwork

Youthwork should either find ways to secure dependable and speedy contract negotiation and funding, and to state in advance reporting requirements, or accept the likelihood that they will be able to deal only with organizations that can absorb the "front end" costs and hidden costs, thereby excluding many desirable sponsors.

Work Experience: Negotiating Entry into Educational Organizations.

One project whose implementation depended upon coordination of two large bureaucracies failed to be implemented. People in each bureaucracy at several layers wanted some authority over decisions, consequently preventing youth in one bureaucracy from receiving services from the other bureaucracy.

Recommendation for DOL

Arrangement of service delivery to the youth in work experience programs should not be dependent upon several large bureaucracies that do not ordinarily work together, and that are physically separated.

Work Experience: Program Staffing for Service Delivery.

Smaller projects were expected to begin project operations with students shortly after being hired. At one site the staff, (a project director, work site coordinator and two learning managers) were unfamiliar with project goals and objectives, as a different set of people had drafted the proposals. Project directors became overwhelmed with project reports due and time needed to work through actual steps of project implementation.

Recommendations for Youthwork

(1) Small projects need flexibility regarding reporting and regulations for the project director who is also responsible for program delivery.

(2) Projects should be allowed a start-up time after hiring project staff to plan goals and set steps for achieving these goals before starting work with the youth. Larger projects sometimes have a staff in other parts of the administration that plans these steps for staff they hire.

II. Structures for Youth Involvement in Program Operation

Six sites have tried to include youth in the program operation as peer counselors. Peer counselor responsibilities included training new project participants in workshops similar to ones they completed for their training as peer counselors (three sites); informal counseling for students in the project (five sites); and recruiting and processing new students for the project (three sites). Four sites paid peer counselors. Three of these four projects redefined the peer counselor activities as mainly recruitment/intake, partly because of difficulty recruiting students (three sites), partly because of questions concerning involving peers in counseling activities (two sites). One way of allowing these peer counselors to work in the high schools was to allow them to first help with recruitment and intake. These two sites also renamed the peer counselors paraprofessionals and aides.

Recommendations for Youthwork

(1) Peer counselor role descriptions should include responsibilities beyond recruitment, intake, and filing.

(2) Peer counselor training should focus on the development of counseling skills youth can use in their work with peers.

(3) Proposals and project staff need to clearly state what they and the school system will allow youth to do as "peer counselors", and outline steps to accomplish these objectives.

(4) Structures for further youth involvement and more responsible participation in program operations in the career awareness area need to be identified, and subsequent strategies for implementation need to be developed.

III. Academic Credit for Work Experience

Academic credit for work experience is systematically generated at one of the eight work experience projects in the career awareness area. Training sessions for projects are located within the schools, and the contract for academic credit is negotiated between the student and his/her academic teacher. Proximity of the project home base to the teachers enhance communication about the expectations for work site learning experiences.

Recommendations for Youthwork

(1) More work experience projects should grant academic credit. Establishing a project home base within the schools offers proximity to students and teachers.

(2) Projects have to take initiatives in developing agreements with schools for academic credit.

(3) Projects that have developed procedures for academic credit should make available procedures for securing academic credit to other projects.

Recommendation for DOL

(1) DOL should encourage the Department of Education at the state level to legitimize work experience curriculum for academic credit.

IV. Staff/Student Relationships

The organizational structure of the delivery system influences the type of contact that project staff have with students, the frequency of that contact, and thereby the responsiveness of the program delivery to student needs. Close relationships or knowledge of students leads to appropriate placements for individuals at worksites as well as to designing and implementing curriculum and instruction that will be interesting and appropriate for their needs.

Recommendations for Youthwork

(1) Proposal evaluation should give priority to projects with structures that encourage close relationships between staff and students.

(2) The evaluation should also consider whether there are adequate and sound provisions for the development of curriculum and instruction tailored to the needs and personal characteristics of those youth.

(3) Worksite supervisor, project liaison, or designated project staff persons should have formal responsibility for maintaining contact with the students during their work experience. This is to ensure that the work experience is also linked to the instruction in academic areas.

CHAPTER SIX

JOB CREATION THROUGH YOUTH-OPERATED PROJECTS

Introduction

Job creation through youth-operated projects was selected as a program focus for Youthwork, Inc., because the area raised important issues in national policy toward youth. Youth are normally the consumers of employment/training services and are not involved in the decision making arenas. As consumers only, youth have been denied important experiences and skills which could be gained from being actively involved from the planning stage through the creation, implementation, and completion of the project effort. The Department of Labor and Youthwork, Inc., (DOL Application Guidelines--Exemplary Program, 1978) have considered this involvement of youth the primary distinction between exemplary programs chosen for this area and programs supported under the other focal areas.

In its design of a pilot Youth Enterprises Development Corporation, the Work Institute of America cited the "need to find ways to create youth-operated enterprises to: (1) increase opportunties, (2) provide outlets for youth leadership abilities, and (3) provide training in management and entrepreneurship". Youth-operated projects were established to give youth a chance to manage their own affairs. In clarifying its aims, the Institute stated (1979:31):

> The solution of the youth employment problem has become synonymous with the development of programs to prepare youth for employment in institutional settings and in activities planned and operated by adults. In most respects, this is as it should be because (1) large numbers of youth will be helped in this fashion, and (2) most will eventually have to work in large institutional settings.
>
> But not all are best helped by "enrollment" in such organized activities, and not all have to work for large organizations. An unknown but significant number of youth in the inner city have leadership ability and no way in which to exercise it. It is a mistaken assumption that all youth who live in the inner city and are without jobs are unpracticed in organizing, persuading, identifying opportunity, and taking advantage of it. Street life and a wide range of economic activities that, if not extralegal, are not advertised in the Yellow Pages, have given some youth in slums opportunities to develop these talents. They are a bases on which to build.

Youth-operated projects are an example of a federal program trying to capitalize on skills youth have already developed. Using skilled community persons as advisors, youth are allowed to participate in the on-going economic life of the community in a meaningful way. This effort will hopefully lead to increasing numbers of poor youth being able to participate in the labor market successfully.

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

The Youthwork grant process selected 12 projects for funding within the youth-operated category. The sites are both rural and urban and have served anywhere from 30 to 500 economically disadvantaged youth. The total number expected to be involved in the projects is approximately 1,750 youth. Three projects are located in major cities with populations exceeding one million people. Four are located in cities with populations between 100,000 and 500,000 people. Three are in cities not quite large enough to qualify as prime sponsors but with populations over 50,000 and two projects are in very remote rural areas. Each of the twelve youth-operated projects are described below:

Site 1: A student operated planning, management, supervision, and personnel office.

Site 2: An alternative learning center that will provide opportunities for career education through work experience.

Site 3: A career planning and youth employment and placement service.

Site 4: A center providing career counseling, remedial instruction in basic skills and work experience.

Site 5: A youth-operated recycling center accompanied by career guidance and counseling.

Site 6: A youth-operated business with academic credit offered through several alternative schools.

Site 7: A school sponsored program offering training in agricultural swine production, child development and care, construction skills, and business office skills.

Site 8: Youth-operated businesses giving academic credit for what young people learn.

Site 9: Academic credit for competencies acquired through work experience.

Site 10: A youth-operated print shop and newspaper.

Site 11: A youth-operated business leading to academic credit.

Site 12: A youth-operated project which provides work experiences, counseling, academic credit for basic skills attainment.

Six of the twelve sites provided data for this report. Of the six contributing projects, three are operated by school systems or alternative schools, two are supported by consortia, and the last is sponsored by a community based organization. Each project has operated from local school facilities. The sites have been in operation for up to 16 months. Table 1 presents a summary of program characteristics for youth-operated projects.

Internal Differences Among Youth-Operated Projects

Several approaches have been used in establishing the youth-operated projects. Graham (1978, p.2) describes these projects as follows:

School sheltered projects:

> These include personal service and business projects inside the school such as tutoring or peer counseling (as in National Commission on Resources for Youth Projects): running a fast food school cafeteria on a concession basis; running a school-based job printing shop for materials used in school and for outside jobs as well; running a school-based student store or bank and loan agency; and providing school bookkeeping services on a contract basis (as a Mesa Verde High School). The projects may also be of a more familiar kind, such as Junior Achievement enterprises; publishing the school newspaper; and putting on a dance, play, or concert, or fund raiser for which work must be divided with money collected and accounted for.

TABLE 1

Characteristics of Youth-Operated Sites

program[a]	operator[b]	population range (in thousands)	where program is conducted[c]	actual/projected number of students to be served[d]		program began
A	CBO	50-250	training center	28/24	116.7%	Feb. 1979
B	LEA	1000+	school	143/180	79.4%	Dec. 1978
C	CONSORTIUM	0-50	training center	80/69	115.9%	Oct. 1978
D	LEA	1000+	training center	98/87	106.9%	March 1979
E	CONSORTIUM	0-50	school	65/64	101.6	Oct. 1978
F	LEA	50-250	school	NA		-
G	Tribe	0-50	training center	59/40	147.5%	-
H	CBO	1000+	-	NA		-
I	CONSORTIUM	50-250	school	136/158	86.1%	Jan. 1979
J	LEA	50-250	school	40/120	33.3%	Dec. 1978
K	LEA	0-50	school	91/135	67.4%	Nov. 1978
L	LEA	250-500	school	346/270	128.1%	Sept. 1978

[a] Programs B, E, F, G, H, L did not provide data for this report.

[b] LEA = local education agency; CBO = community based organization; CONSORTIA = combination of agencies come together to foster youth programs.

[c] Training centers are located at facilities owned by these organizations.

[d] These approximations are based upon our most recent Management Information System (MIS) data (December, 1979), and should not be construed to be current official numbers for the sites. The projected number shown is also approximately the number of students each site expected to serve during the length of the program. NA = not available.

Projects of Personal or Community Service Outside of School:

> These include youth employment services (such as Rent-a-kid of Boston); organizing a teen center or a hot line; operating a transportation pool; carrying out a community clean-up project; creating a mini-park; conducting a community survey, managing a recycling center, or providing services for the aged or retarded (many of these are reported in National Student Volunteer Program publications, ACTION, Washington, D.C.).

Income Producing Outside of School:

> These include franchised businesses for youth; community based organizations and youth-operated service or contracting businesses such as building maintenance or restoration.

Program strategies consist of the services offered at each site. The rationale for using this as a key sorter for youth-operated projects is that it represents a basic programmatic distinction which can be made within the youth-operated project focal area. The program strategies are peer counseling, work experience, and youth as entrepreneurs.

This chapter is an effort to delineate the internal differences among youth-operated projects. The strategies will be analyzed in terms of variations in program administration, youth involvement, academic credit, and curriculum. Table 2 presents a breakdown of participating projects by organizational sponsor and program strategy.

TABLE 2

Youth-Operated Projects by Organizational Sponsor and Program Strategy

	Program Strategies		
Organizational Sponsor	Work Experience	Peer Counseling	Youth Entrepreneurs
LEA	3 (1)*	1 (1)	2 (1)
CONSORTIA	0	1 (1)	1 (1)
COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATION	3 (1)	1 (0)	0

*Numbers in parentheses are those of participating projects for this report.

Two caveats need to be emphasized. The first is suggested by Graham (1978):

> There is not a clear distinction among the approaches to youth-operated projects, nor is there a neat division between projects almost entirely started and run by youth and those in which youth participate but which are set up and supervised by adults. The projects have several purposes in common, although they differ in what they emphasize (p. 2).

Given that the distinctions between types is blurred and the definition of categories is often arbitrary, it is difficult (if not impossible) to discern individual treatment effects.

The second caveat is posited by Pressman (1978) and is more explicit about the dangers of viewing the Youthwork, Inc. effort as an experiment:

> The distinction is important, because knowledge development as defined in Youthwork's agreement with the Labor Department, emphasized the development of information and ideas which are wanted and needed by the potential users of the knowledge, and recognizes the unlikelihood of developing truly experimental research designs in the time available and under the constraints and conditions which exist (p. 1).

While the lack of sufficient controls makes it difficult to draw causal inferences from the data, tentative conclusions will be drawn which can be tested in subsequent research. Such findings can provide critical information for implementing future projects.

Before discussing the findings, it would be well to examine the three strategies found within the cluster of youth-operated projects, i.e., work experience, youth as entrepreneurs, and peer counseling. This review will highlight selected dimensions of the different strategies and their functioning.

Work Experience

Since the middle 1960's, millions of dollars have been spent on programs such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps or SPEDY to provide part-time employment for poor in-school youth. What has all of this support and effort contributed to the development of these youth? In a comprehensive review of the literature related to work experience programs for in-school youth, Mangum and Walsh (DOL, 1978) summarize their findings in the following manner:

> The overwhelming conclusion of existing literature is that neither in-school nor summer work experience programs in the traditional mold have long term beneficial effects on enrollees. Given the complex nature of the dropout problem and the variety of social and personal factors which cause students to drop out, a series of GAO reports found the work experience concept too simplistic an approach to bring about any dramatic results (p. 56).

Some of the research examined by Mangum and Walsh which provided the basis for their conclusions came from Pines and Morlock who, in Work Experience Perspectives (1978), conclude that "bare bones" work experience programs (which provide no more than a job) will not be effective for most youth. North Star's follow-up studies of 1144 rural youth who held part-time work experience jobs in high school did not show measurable beneficial effects from participation in work experience programs (Miles, et al., 1973). National Longitudinal Survey data indicate that work experience demonstrates no particular advantage for girls enrolled in school (Years for Decision, 1977). Among Spanish youth in the southwest and rural youth in the southeast, North Star found that occupational success was not significantly related to whether they had worked part-time in high school (Miles, et al., 1973, 1974). Department of Labor sponsored evaluations in general support the conclusion that work experience by itself has no appreciable effect on the employability of enrollees (Mangum and Walsh, 1978). Walther, in the Labor Department's most definitive analysis on various youth programs strategies, notes that positive results were achieved only when work experiences were directly relevant to a post program job (1976).

The picture for work experience programs was not entirely negative. In a 1968 nationwide study of 60 in-school and summer Neighborhood Youth Corps projects, Somers and Stromsdorfer (1972) found that significant monetary benefits accrued to NYC in-school participants: "The average NYC participant earned a total of $831 more than his comparison group counterpart in the year and a half average period after the NYC participant left the program." Systems Development Corporations' study of work-education programs (1973) found that participants in the Vocational Education Part H work-study program remained in school longer than participants in other work experience programs.

Furthermore, Taggart (1976) classifies as "mildly encouraging" the evidence concerning the impact of work experience on crime and delinquency. A study conducted in Detroit and Cincinnati found no evidence that delinquency was reduced, while a study conducted in Cincinnati and Durham concluded the exact opposite, finding that the number of charges against enrollees declined noticeably relative to controls, as did the severity of the offenses. A regression analysis of summer long funding levels and youth arrests in Washington, D.C. concluded that an "extra three summer slots will lead to one less reported offense," supporting the notion that summer youth programs help keep the streets safe.

The majority of the evidence indicates that work experience for in-school youth has failed to live up to its expectations. Several authors have noted that this may be due in part to over expectation. Levitan, Mangum and Marshall (1976) maintain that although NYC was:

> ostensibly justified as a route to employability, (it) is primarily income maintenance accompanied by a minimum of

> useful activity. This does not mean that it is not desirable, only that it should be approached more honestly. Poor people need income and something at which to keep busy as a bridge between school enrollment and work or to help them at a vulnerable age when opportunities may be scarce...The tendency over the years has been for the quality of the work experience to improve and the accompaniment of basic education to grow. There is evidence that the Neighborhood Youth Corps makes a positive contribution to employment (p. 57).

In paraphrasing these authors, Mangum and Walsh (1978) suggest:

> What the authors seem to be saying is that we should lower our expectations: that the cultural, environmental, and personal reasons why some youth drop out of school may be beyond the healing powers of simple work experience. If policy makers and program operators are at last ready to face this fact, the time may have arrived when the more profound reasons for school dropouts and youth labor market failure can be the subject of research. If this ever happens, it is almost certain that the results will indicate that solutions to many of these problems are beyond the scope of ordinary employment and training programs (p. 57).

Although the literature is conflicting, it is clear that straight work experience programs cannot be considered the answer to the nations' youth unemployment problem. Given that expectations can be lowered and the problem approached more honestly, there may be a positive role for these programs to play in dealing with the symptoms of the problem.

Youth as Entrepreneurs

The evidence concerning these types of programs is much less published and documented. This by no means suggests that there is little happening in the field. Several examples of past projects will be described here to demonstrate their potential as growth mechanisms for youth.[1]

---

[1] Examples are taken from New Roles for Youth in the School and Community. National Commission on Resources for Youth, Citation Press, 1974, New York, pp. 104-105.

-Home economics students at Jefferson High School in Portland, Oregon, have established a restaurant that is open for lunch five days a week and serves both students and teachers. A chef supervises the kitchen, and the home economics teacher supervises the entire operation. The dining area is a classroom converted by students into a pleasing, relaxing place with tables, chairs, linen, and crockery that the students purchased. Students select menus and prepare the food as well as performing all the other functions of a restaurant: keeping accounts, cleaning the kitchen and eating area and so forth.

-The Bedford Pines Buttermilk Bottoms Buying Club was initiated by young people and housewives living in an impoverished part of Atlanta, Georgia. Housewives had noted that different grocery stores in their part of the city charged very different prices for the same items. Working with high school students whose help they requested, they made a list of the most commonly purchased items such as eggs, milk and detergents. The students took the list from store to store and compared prices for each item. The results of their survey showed that prices for the same item varied by as much as one hundred and fifty percent. The students then made this information available throughout the community. Community members who had previously been apathetic about the problem were greatly angered when they discovered that their friendly corner grocer, who often gave popsicles to their children, was overcharging them. Working with the American Friends Service Committee, the students and adults figured out where they could buy these items in quantity at wholesale prices. They then in effect, set up a cooperative by taking everyone's order to a wholesaler and buying the items for the neighborhood all at once at considerable savings.

-Rent-a-kid grew out of the West End Neighborhood Development Center in Atlanta, Georgia. High school students desperately needed summer jobs. The staff of the center suggested they set up and advertise a service whereby anyone wishing part-time help could call a central number to get a young person to help. The city media willingly aided the young people by advertising their availability. Kids themselves manned the phones. Businesses and individuals who needed their lawns cut, cars washed, or odd jobs done kept the phones ringing all summer.

These programs are but a few of the growing number of projects developed around the country by student entrepreneurs. The benefits from these programs are many and they extend to the students themselves, the schools and the community. As the National Commission on Resources for Youth (1974) has reported, the benefits include:

(1) "Students benefit from participating in learning programs that relate to their personal hopes and plans, and they become more attentive students as they get a clearer idea of the contributions an organized educational program can make to the realization of their current and future aspirations" (p. 105).

(2) "Schools benefit by reexamining their programs to determine what is effective and what needs to be changed—both in content and in teaching methods. Schools benefit by finding opportunities to stimulate the interest of teachers who have become bored with a traditional program and irritated by or

immune to- its failure to elicit enthusiastic responses from students. Schools also benefit by becoming more open to the creative ideas and youthful energy of teachers just entering the profession" (p. 106).

(3) "Communities benefit by a student program that makes vital goods and services available--often at reduced prices" (p. 106).

This discussion has highlighted the positive side of programs which have encouraged youth entrepreneurship. To be sure, there are many problems with creating programs of this kind. Not all ideas are feasible. Ideas have to be evaluated, priorities determined, and the skills of problem solving have to be learned. The influence of personality factors has to be recognized and dealt with, failure has to be anticipated, and the ability and willingness to accept the validity of some failures have to be created. Many programs run by and for adults fail for these very reasons. There is no basis for suspecting that young people will somehow be immune to these same problems.

Peer Counseling

There are a number of reasons why the concept of "youth helping youth" is an important one. The creation of programs which employ this approach have mushroomed in recent years in part because many young people feel cut off from the adult community. The factors which have served to cut youth off from the adult community--accelerated pace of change, weakening of family bonds, the increase of impersonal communications media such as television and film--have made young people more aware of themselves as a distinct group. Young people are developing a sense of shared problems. Youth are coming to realize that they, themselves, have a unique potential for helping to solve the problems of other youth.

Administrators in projects directed toward youth are discovering the same thing. "Evidence collected from projects where young people serve as resources for people their own age or younger strongly suggests that just being young is valuable in dealing with the problems of the young" (NCRY, 1974, p. 196).

Youth serving youth is a system which allows young people to act as resource persons for personal problems, job information, academic remediation, and community services. As such, the concept has potential for making a valuable contribution to the mental health of a community. Several such projects which have been developed are described below.[2]

- Number Nine in New Haven, Connecticut, is a particularly interesting project in which all the staff are under twenty-five years old and live in an old sixteen-room house. Number Nine grew out of a twenty-four hour emergency telephone service. In addition to operating the telephone service, Number Nine now has a store front for recreation and counseling and housing for short-term room and board. Staff members also go out into the New Haven community to give on-the-spot help with problems such as drug addiction.
- HELP in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, has focused on the fact that young people on the streets are often the victims of a wide variety of misinformation. It was founded early in 1970 by a group of young people who, having been arrested themselves, knew how difficult it was to find a trusted person from whom they could seek aid and advice. HELP has dedicated itself to becoming expert on many of the

---

[2] Examples are taken from New Roles for Youth in the School and Community. National Commission on Resources for Youth, Citation Press, 1974, New York, pp. 206-208.

problems that young people seem likely to encounter. Like other programs, it maintains some clinical services and can find runaways a place to sleep. The very heart of HELP is its twenty-four hour telephone service that handles upwards of three hundred calls a day about problems such as drug addiction, pregnancy and possible suicide. The telephone service offers a comforting voice and objective information, and it provides access to necessary resources--volunteer doctors, lawyers, and psychiatrists.

-Youth to Youth on Drug Abuse Education in San Francisco, California works directly through the San Francisco schools. Older high school students have organized themselves to use peer pressure to discourage younger high school students from becoming involved with drugs. They have conducted teach-ins, prepared multi-media instructional aids, and organized in-depth studies of the drug scene.

-The Friend to Friend program sponsored by the Jewish Social Service Agency in Rockville, Maryland, arranges for high school boys and girls to spend several hours each week for a whole year with handicapped persons their own age, on a one-to-one basis. Some magical things have occurred. A seventeen year old boy in a wheel chair was taken to a museum for the first time in his life. A twenty year old girl with cerebral palsy learned how to bake. Two retarded girls enjoyed a slumber party with their volunteers.

As in the projects described in the Youth as Entrepreneurs section, effective adult support is a necessary prerequisite for successful operation of such a program. This support comes from those who have confidence in youth's ability to exercise initiative, to be creative, and to operate responsibly. Supportive adults must assess their roles very carefully so that they will not distort the basic concept involved--youth as resources for youth.

FINDINGS

I. Program Administration

Who makes what decisions, when, and how? These are all key questions in understanding how a project functions. The three program strategies are described in the following section in terms of who, what and how the program functions and under whose direction.

Work Experience. Two of the six youth-operated projects providing data for this report operate as work experience programs. The administrative set-up is similar for each, although, one operates within a school system and the other functions from a community based organization.

The decision-making structure of both programs consists of a program coordinator, several counselors/advisors, and an advisory board. At the community based organization, the program coordinator had responsibility for the operation of the project. Within the LEA sponsored project, the coordinator shared responsibility for the project with the local high school principal.

In both instances, the structure could be described as hierarchical. The LEA sponsored project represents a more autocratic style while the community based organization used a participatory model. Although authority was shared with the school principal of the LEA site, most decisions were made by the program coordinator. Many decisions made by the community organization were first brought before a general staff meeting of the project. These meetings often included some of the youth. Such a structure, while chaotic often led to more consensus around the decisions which were finally made.

The administrative responsibilities at these sites fall into two categories: programmatic and reporting. The programmatic functions involve such items as academic credit, academic remediation, discipline problems, and work schedules. The reporting tasks involve contact with outside groups to which the program is responsible. Both functions seem to be highly centralized at the LEA sponsored site with all of the work, both programmatic and reporting, being accomplished from the program coordinator's office. At the community based organization, programmatic functions are performed by the staff (e.g., counselors/teachers) and reporting tasks are handled by the program coordinator.

Peer Counseling. The two projects using this strategy are operated by an LEA and a CETA-school consortium. The decision-making structures of the two are markedly different. At the LEA, adult staff control the project. Youth staff have input into decisions but the final decision is made by adults. At the consortium project, the entire staff is made up of youth. This includes the project coordinator, the peer counselors, and the clerical help. One adult has been assigned as advisor to the group from the CETA prime sponsor's office. This role is more than a perfunctory one as the adult holds a veto over the staff's actions but through restrained use of this power by the adult, the youth have come to realize that it is truly their project.

The LEA sponsored project is participatory and decentralized. Decisions are made primarily by the adult staff with some participation by youth peer staff. The observer notes that:

> The program administration is participatory and decentralized. It is participatory in that professional staff have access to the Project Administrator at any time and that management decisions are made with the input of the professional staff. It is decentralized in that each staff member is relatively autonomous to manage his or her component with little interference from the Project Administrator.

The consortium project has office space in several city schools and the peer staff are assigned to work independently at each site. The peer staff make their own appointments, set their own hours, and generally function in an autonomous fashion.

At the LEA project, there are many joint efforts in administration. The program coordinator and the senior staff cooperate closely in trying to help the project function smoothly. The observer suggests:

> Without question, this program requires team effort for success. The very nature of the components and their interrelationships with one another necessitate a joint effort for adequate evaluation for participants. Failure of one component not to complete its obligations will impact negatively on participant outcome. For example, it does not make sense to have a participant go through career education, work evaluation and not some employability skill training. The timing and link of each component is very important and can only be done cooperatively through team effort. A "one man" show would be diametrically opposed to the program concept and quite frankly would not be successful.

At the consortium, decision-making has been impaired by the number of outside actors who have been able to intervene in the internal affairs of the project. The joint efforts of the youth staff to overcome these outside influences has provided a sense of togetherness which has strengthened the project. Officials from the

CETA prime sponsor's office, the school board, and Washington have all had a hand in delaying some phase of this project. For example, the project wanted to set-up a network through which youth could acquire summer jobs. The peer counselors would act as contact persons and referral agents. To set up this network, the youth felt that they needed publicity to make people in the community aware of their service. They agreed to have Washington (through Youthwork) put out a national news bulletin announcing the program and to distribute leaflets in the local community. This was in late June or July, 1979.

Approval was needed from at least two persons at the local prime sponsor's office and from Youthwork and the Department of Labor before any publicity could begin. Receiving the necessary approvals delayed the announcement of the program by two months. Instead of beginning the program in early July, it actually was announced in September--too late to help those youth in need of summer jobs. This experience should be a useful one for those youth who have participated since it has provided a significant opportunity to find out how decisions are frequently made.

Administrative responsibilities involve record keeping/reporting and programmatic functions. At the LEA project, the project coordinator handles, for example, school reports and requisitions while the professional staff decide participant flow, program curriculum, and case conferencing by meeting informally with one another or in staff meetings. The consortium project operates somewhat differently in that reporting functions are handled by the project coordinator and the adult advisor. Programmatic functions are the responsibility of the youth staff.

The major criticism of both projects has been the failure to establish enough structure. In commenting on this situation at the LEA site, the observer notes:

> Generally, the administrative structure of the program has remained flexible and congruent with the Center's goals and objectives. Perhaps the major criticism has been a lack of structured staff meetings to share information on curriculum, problems, and procedures. Recently, it was agreed that weekly staff meetings would be held to resolve issues of mutual concern.

The consortium site has held frequent meetings, but, because the youth staff are new to their roles, it appears that more time (greater than 12 months) is needed before they can begin to assert themselves effectively.

Youth as Entrepreneurs. The two sites utilizing this strategy are operated by an LEA and a CETA/school consortium. The decision-making structure is very similar for the two projects. There is a central administration and several advisors who lead independent groups of youth who propose and implement their own projects. Each project uses school personnel as advisors for its youth groups.

Program administration, at both sites, is decentralized and participatory. The youth have more influence over the decisions that are made in these projects than in either of the other two types. This is a result of the way in which the programs were designed. Both projects utilized multi-site designs with the youth acting as staff persons under the supervision of an adult advisor.

The administrative responsibilities, reporting and programmatic, at both sites are handled in a similar fashion. Reporting to outside groups is carried out by the central administration of the projects and the programmatic functions are controlled by each of the youth groups and their advisors. Through this experience, youth are learning how to evaluate ideas and make decisions.

II. Structures for Youth Involvement

Youth involvement in program operation represents one means of allowing youth to impact upon the social organization of the project. Youth-operated projects have initiated different ways for involving youth in the day-to-day operation of the projects. These initiatives are described by strategy.

Work Experience. The opportunities for youth input at work experience projects are limited. Generally, they have been restricted to attendance at infrequently held meetings of the entire project. At both the LEA sponsored project and the community based organization project, attendance at these meetings has been poor. Participation in the meeting, especially at the LEA, was even worse. Aside from the general project meetings, youth are seldom encouraged to participate in meaningful ways. At both sites, there are "youth councils" which operate in an advisory capacity for the project. These councils rarely meet and even more rarely have goals which they are pursuing. At the community project, youth often engaged in arguments with staff over points of disagreement with little ever being done to resolve the issue. Youth comments or suggestions were seldom given serious consideration. From an observer interview with a participating youth, the youth is quoted as saying:

> He said what he dislikes are "turnabout trips," or being treated like puppets. By this, he meant adults who say one thing and then change their minds later, or change the policy (without consulting youth). He said that the manner of presentation sometimes implies that youth are at fault when he feels youth are not guilty.

Recently, the community organization has adopted a policy of training some youth for jobs which parallel those of the professional staff. This was done so as to allow some participation by youth in decision-making but primarily because youth had "griped" about the lack of their own authority. In commenting on the development of these youth roles, the observer notes:

> The staff are aware that youth may not relate to them as role models because they are different, if they have been to college, or have had better opportunities. It was felt that youth must see an opportunity for them in a similar role before they are motivated to act.

This suggests that the adult staff have become aware of at least one of the inconsistencies at this youth-operated project.

The LEA sponsored site does provide four options from which youth can choose, thus granting some measure of control over what they do in the program. These options also allow youth to transfer from one component of the program to another. Such decision-making by youth is not present at the community organization project.

One of the most difficult issues faced by the students in these projects is how to initiate program changes to meet their own self-defined needs. Structurally, the mechanisms exist in both of these programs for youth to propose changes. That does not guarantee that the adult staff are required to listen or act on the request for changes. Achieving change requires power. Youth have no institutionalized power to create change in work experience projects.

Peer Counseling. At peer counseling projects, two different situations exist as far as structures for youth involvement in program operation are concerned. The LEA project provides limited opportunity for input by participants. A note from the observer explains this situation.

> Structures for youth input into the operation of the program are limited to peer staff meetings and peer policy board meetings. Generally, the issues discussed in these meetings are superficial and do not involve curriculum or in-depth structural changes to the program. Such meetings are a vehicle to address procedural issues. Input by regular participants is limited.

Contrary to this, opportunities for youth involvement at the consortium project are great. As was stated earlier, the staff of the project is made up entirely of youth. Youth at this project have the ability to change procedures and rules (within certain broad constraints) to allow them to perform their jobs in a more personally satisfying way. These changes are often accomplished at frequently held staff meetings.

At the LEA site, a few youth are trained as peer staff but their opportunities for input are limited to situations where they are under the direct supervision of adult professional staff. As the observer notes:

> Peer staff have been trained to procedurally operate the program (i.e., administer tests and use equipment) as assistants to the professional staff. Rate of participant flow, guidance and counseling, and evaluation continue to be carried out by professional staff. Peer staff normally carry out their functions under the auspices of the professional staff member to which they are assigned.

Youth at the consortium site have wide latitude to develop and implement their own plans. Because the staff often work independently, they must use their own best judgment when relating to their clients. The youth at this site are an integral part of the program's operation.

Institutionalized options exist for youth at both programs. At the LEA site, the observer notes:

> Students commit their plan of action to paper and exercise their options as to what they would like to do while they are in the various components of the program. At any point in the program, students also have the flexibility to change their program although this does not happen frequently. A student's choice for participation in key components of the program (e.g., career education) is determined by his referral source (e.g., he may only need career education), scheduling, and degree of commitment. These key components remain fixed although students can select options within each component.

At the consortium project, participants are offered a broad range of services by the peer staff. The youth and the peer staff member choose those services most appropriate to meet the needs of the youth. The mix of services can be changed at any point that the need changes.

Youth as Entrepreneurs. Youth involvement is widespread at these projects. Youth are involved in central administration decisions at both programs. The consortium project has a central steering committee which oversees all of the projects. The committee membership is comprised of fifty percent youth and fifty percent adults. It acts as a screening agent for proposals, making recommendations on both acceptance and funding levels.

Motivation is seen as a problem by adult staff at these projects. The consortium site began (December 1978) with 12 projects functioning and now (January 1980) has only 5. Inhibiting the duration of these projects may involve a lack of motivation by the youth, but a more prominent reason is the changing life circumstances of any person in the 14-21 year age bracket. The turnover in these projects has been high and each time key youth are lost, the project has had to be delayed or scrapped altogether. In a discussion with a member of the YNPS staff, the program operator for this project suggested:

> More efforts need to be directed at 1) encouraging youth to follow through on an effort until it is finished and on 2) selecting projects which can be completed within a specified time frame.

Structures for youth involvement at both projects are developed by the youth themselves. Therefore, the options made available are those created by the youth themselves. To the extent that options are needed, the youth have the tools with which to make the necessary changes. Adults are used as facilitators to help youth overcome barriers due to insufficient information or lack of confidence in their own abilities.

III. Academic Credit

From the six projects providing data for this report, only 2 youth are receiving academic credit (MIS, Blackstone Institute, December 1979). Given the small numbers of youth this has affected at youth-operated projects, there seems little rationale for describing the process by which academic credit is granted. In the future, if academic credit becomes a more generic issue, the details of the process can be focused upon.

IV. Program Curriculum

A variety of strategies have been combined in the designing of the curricula for youth-operated projects. These curricula are described in the next section.

Work Experience. The components of the two work experience programs are school and work. A typical day involves the youth spending part of the time in regular classroom training and part on the job. The curricula were designed by school administrators and teachers (for the LEA site) and by the staff of the community based organization for its project. The programs, as a rule, have melded well with the school system. This was by design for the LEA site since it operates as a part of the school system but the community based organization had to rely on its flexibility to bring about a compatible relationship. For example, some of the enrollees at this site work during the day and attend school at night. Others have a more traditional set up where they are involved in school part-day and work part-day. By utilizing its many community resources, the community organization has been able to work with both the local LEA and the youth to find the best approach for successfully matching school and work. There are still problems involved in negotiating the linkage between the schools and the community based organization but, generally, the schools are receptive to schedule changes which will allow a poor youth to work. Youth input into the curricula at work experience projects has been minimal. The curricula were in place before youth were recruited and has not changed in any significant way since the beginning of the program.

The youth, at the LEA project, are involved in one of four activities designed to give them "hands on" experience in an area of vocational interest. These experiences include office work, bookkeeping, construction, and child care services. Youth are supervised in each of these areas by skilled staff.

The community based organization hires youth to operate a commercial business. The youth make pick-ups and deliveries for the operation and recently have begun to participate in an apprentice-type program which will train youth to someday take over management functions.

Peer Counseling. Curricula at the two peer counseling projects vary considerably. One is a highly structured diagnostic sequence, which is offered by the LEA project, and the second is a loosely defined referral service sponsored by the consortium project.

The consortium project offers no services of its own but draws on the community for services when youth are in need. The curriculum involves the training of peer staff to counsel youth. The LEA project has a highly structured service which it offers to its clients. A detailed description, by the on-site observer, of the curriculum for this program is presented below. The description is based on material provided by the project operator.

Phase I: Intake

A critical entry level component is the intake process. After the individual has been certified by CETA, they are then eligible for the Center (although many times the students will enroll first and only later be sent through CETA intake.) In program intake, an attempt is made to enthusiastically orient the students to the Center in such a way that they feel they will benefit by participating. A "selling" effort takes place to convince the participants of how valuable it is for them to know how to set realistic vocational goals.

During this phase of the program, the participant also takes a number of psychometric tests. These include a pretest attitudinal scale, a GED diagnostic achievement test, and an aptitude test. The tests are not lengthy and the students are encouraged to do their best. Since there are no grade scores, nor are they compared to others, the participants are generally cooperative. The information is confidential. The program intake phase takes about 2 to 3 hours depending on the student's reading level, degree of interest and the time that he or she is willing to commit. They are then referred to the Career Resource Lab.

Phase II: Career Resource Lab

In the Career Resource Lab, the student takes several career interest inventories and is then oriented to several careers based on his or her career preference. This is accomplished through career research and establishing a short-and long-range plan of action. Other activities involve participating in a personality assessment inventory, a self-administered values survey and various worker trait inventories. In this lab, the student also learns to use resource materials, read microfiche of local employment opportunities and do job shadowing. Generally, they spend about 3 to 4 days in this component (assuming 2 hours per day). When they complete this phase of the program, they are ready for an Individual Education Plan (IEP).

Phase III: Individual Education Plan

The IEP is the student's "plan of action" while they are at the Center. Ostensibly, it is designed to permit the participants to establish some realistic vocational goals while they are in the program. This is accomplished by convening an IEP committee composed of peer staff and at least one professional staff member (if they are not present, this staff member will review the final plan). Every effort is made to involve the student in mapping out his or her direction (i.e., the participant writes out his or her own goals, objectives, and level of participation in program components) through the advisory role of the committee.

The reason the IEP committee is generally convened after the student has been in the Career Resource Lab for a few days is because he or she has had the opportunity to evaluate their career interests and is in a position to write realistic goals. Once they complete the IEP phase, they are referred to the work evaluation lab.

Phase IV: Work Evaluation Lab

The work evaluation lab is probably the most interesting component of the program. The work evaluation lab is composed of a series of simulated work stations that operate on the premise that every job requires a worker to function in relation to "data, people and things". This is the Department of Labor's worker trait group. Students are also evaluated on their gross motor skills (e.g., manual dexterity, bi-manual coordination, and eye-hand coordination), work tolerances, work productivity, sensory skills and physical capabilities. This information is compiled into a comprehensive evaluation report that is presented to the students upon their exit from the lab. Since each station takes about 2 hours to complete, the student will stay in this lab about 3 weeks. When they complete this phase of the program, they return to the career lab for more career research and employability skill training and/or job placement.

Phase V: Employability Skills

It has been only recently that the employability skills lab has developed a structured curriculum. In this component, the student participates (in a sequential process) in a learning process related to preparing personal fact sheets, finding job openings, using employment agencies (particularly state agencies), reading and understanding want ads, filling out applications, phoning about jobs and practice interviewing. Simultaneously, the work placement coordinator works with students individually in helping them obtain employment, visit vocational training schools, and helping them to receive on the job training.

Phase VI: Termination

When a consensus is reached by the professional staff that the student has completed the program, an exit conference is held between the Guidance Counselor (and sometimes the Work Evaluator) and the participant. In the exit conference, the Guidance Counselor goes over with the participant the recommendations of the program staff, reviews the work evaluation report, and finalizes the IEP (i.e., did the participant complete his or her stated goals and objectives). The participant is also encouraged to continue to utilize the resources of the Center at his/her convenience.

Summary

Several points have to be made in commenting on the curriculum:

1. Because the program is totally individualized, it is not necessarily a set policy that all participants go through the entire program. It might only be necessary for them to complete the work evaluation lab or go directly to work placement. An IEP, however, is done on all participants.

2. Generally, it takes an individual about 6 weeks to complete the program assuming they participate at least 2 hours a day. However, this varies greatly due to absenteeism, time of availability and extent of commitment.
3. An important component of the program but one not addressed in the preceding paragraphs is academic remediation. To date, an Academic Remediation Teacher has not been hired because the program's FTE has not warranted it. However, remediation is done by the Guidance Counselor on a limited basis.
4. To date, there is no way of ascertaining the true effectiveness of the program's curriculum (i.e., do participants stay in school, do adjudicated delinquents return to the courts, do graduates go on training, etc.). No follow-up is being conducted at the site.

Youth as Entrepreneurs. The curricula for these two projects is broadly defined and is very similar to that of work experience programs. At one project, youth spend part of their day in school and part working on their projects. The youth at the site determine what the curriculum will be. Generally, this has involved accomplishing tasks which would lead to the implementation of their projects.

The curricula being taught involves learning how to plan, implement, and manage a business or service enterprise. Most of these ventures are small retail businesses. Youth gain experience by being responsible for the day-to-day operations of the project. At some projects, this includes the creation of the products to be sold.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Program Administration

The youth-operated projects reflect a hierarchical management/administrative scheme with program coordinators and school officials as key decision-makers. The style of decision-making was participatory and decentralized with front line staff (supervisors, advisors) having wide responsibility for program operation. This resulted in many different decisions being made to deal with the same problem. This reduced the cohesiveness of the program structure.

Recommendations to Youthwork

A major criticism of the administration of these programs by staff was that there was too little structure and an inability to handle recurring problems. The solution to this situation employed by most operators was to increase the frequency of staff meetings in the hopes of creating a consensus around any decision that was made. This method, while partially successful, leaves unanswered questions. It is recommended that Youthwork should:

(1) Provide technical assistance to sites on the roles and responsibilities key staff should assume.

(2) Seminars on project operation should be offered by Youthwork to acquaint potential/current operators with the problems these programs may generate. The Youthwork "How to do it" manuals might be useful in this regard.

II. Youth Involvement

Youthwork has posed the question of youth involvement as one of its major research issues (Policy issues, 1979). For the youth as entrepreneurs strategy, as well as one peer counseling project, the level of youth involvement has been quite high. In each of these cases, the youth were responsible for the day-to-day operation of the project, usually with an adult as the project's advisor. Involvement by youth at the other projects was less in comparison to these projects.

Recommendations to Youthwork

If youth involvement is of high priority for Youthwork programs (Pressman, 1978; Policy issues, 1979), then Youthwork should encourage:

(1) Programs which allow youth to build their own enterprises as in the youth as entrepreneurs strategy; and/or

(2) Programs which utilize youth as the program staff as in the peer counseling strategy.

III. Program Curriculum

A second research question posed by Youthwork (Policy issues, 1979) addresses the transferability of job skills learned at youth-operated projects. The question is, "What are the projects' abilities to identify and develop transferable work skills?" This chapter allows for an indirect examination of this issue. The three strategies (i.e. work experience, peer counseling, entrepreneurs), as curricula, each represent a kind of job training to which some youth are exposed.

At the two work experience projects, youth performed jobs in a sheltered environment within a larger institution (either LEA or CBO). The skills taught, especially those at the LEA, have considerable transferability to such occupations as child care and construction worker. The jobs at the community based organization are in a narrow field and would be useful in other fields only in a general sense. For example, learning to come to work on time and to follow instructions are skills which would be valuable on most any job.

The peer counseling sites provided training which can be transferred to service fields such as social work and counseling. The added experience at the consortium project of being in control of the work site also provides valuable training to the youth, although, at this time it is hard to say if this skill will prove to be transferable.

It is more difficult to identify specific job skills which have been learned at the youth as entrepreneur sites. Several different tasks had to be accomplished by these sites. These include planning, implementation, and administration of projects. Many of the projects involved some form of retail business. Whatever skills are inherent in this kind of job would presumably have been learned by youth in these projects.

The skills garnered by participants at youth-operated projects are, as a rule, related to specific occupations which are available in the labor market. The work experience project sponsored by the LEA offers training in construction and child care skills. The peer staff sites focus on social service delivery skills and the youth as entrepreneurs projects involve skills related to retail sales and management.

The "reality" of these training experiences is a positive factor in these programs.

Most projects suggest that their primary interest is in improving the general work habits of their enrollees. Program operators cite the poor attendance and bad attitude of enrollees as the primary barrier between the youth and unsubsidized employment. While much is made of the need to improve these habits of enrollees, there are few (if any) systematic programs designed to encourage appropriate behavior by youth.

Closer scrutiny of programs and program operators is needed to insure that youth receive the training which they need.

Recommendations to Department of Labor

It is recommended to the Department of Labor that it:

(1) Specify what constitutes "acceptable" job skill training. Skill training in areas where there are no jobs or for youth who have little chance of attaining "that kind of job" does little to benefit the unemployed youth. This definition should vary by geographic location and population mix.

(2) Coordinate skill training programs with the local education authority so that they coincide with the local high school education program. It is recommended that the skill training should be completed at the same time as the youth graduates from high school. This allows the youth to be trained at the time he becomes availabe to move into the labor market.

Recommendations to Youthwork

(1) Require of program officials that there be a known job market (locally) for the skills being taught.

(2) Provide programs with a capacity for job search and placement to help youth acquire their first job after the program.

REFERENCES

Adams, A. and G.L. Mangum
1978 The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment. Kalamazoo: W. E. Upjohn Institute.

Bachman, J.G., et al.
1978 Youth in Transition: Volume VI, Change and Stability in the Lives of Young Men. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

Banker, N.
1979 Knowledge Development Guide: Academic Credit for Work Experience, Youthwork, Inc.

Becker, H.S.
1955 "Careers in a Deviant Occupational Group." Social Problems, Vol. 2, No. 2.

Bellack, A.A. (ed.)
1966 Theory and Research in Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Berryman, S.E.
1978 "Youth Unemployment and Career Education: Reasonable Expectations," Public Policy. Vol. 26, No. 1, Winter, pp. 26-29.

Biddle, B.J. and R.S. Adams
1967 "An analysis of classroom activities." Columbia: University of Missouri Center for Research in Social Behavior.

Bogdon, R. and S. Taylor
1978 Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods. New York: J. Wiley and Sons.

Clark, M.
1947 "Racial identification and preference in Negro children," in A.H. Passow (ed.) Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Columbia University Press.

Coleman, J.S., et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education.

1974 Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Demone, H.W. and D. Harshbarger
1973 The Planning and Administration of Human Services, Behavioral Publications.

Denzin, N.
1970 The Research Act. Chicago: Aldine.

Frankel, S.
1976 Cited in "The Competencies of Youth", R.W., From School to Work: Improving the Transition, U.S. Commission on Manpower Policy, U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 89-116.

Goffman, E.
1963 Asylums. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Goldenberg, I.
1971 Build Me A Mountain: Youth Poverty and the Creation of New Settings. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Goodman, M.
1952 Race Awareness in Young Children. New York: Collier.

Goodman, P. and P. Salipante
1973 "Hiring, Training and Retraining the Hard-Core Unemployed: A Selected Review", Journal of Applied Psychology, 58, 23-33.

Gouldner, A.
1954 Patterns of Industrial Bureacracy. New York: Free Press.

Graham, R.A.
1978 "Private Sector Employment Projects for Youth", Washington, D.C.: Youthwork, Inc. (unpublished).

1979 "Practical Alternative for Educating the Poor: Education Remedies for Youth Unemployment." A paper for the Vice President's Conference on Youth Unemployment, Baltimore, Md. Sept. 26-29, 1979, pp. 4-5.

1978 "Youth Planned and Operated In-School and Community Based Projects". Youthwork, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Hatch, D.
1948 "Changes in the structures and functions of a rural New England community since 1900", Ph.D. dissertation. Harvard University.

Henry, J.
1963 Culture Against Man. New York: Random House.

Henslin, J.
1967 "The cab driver: an interactional analysis of an occupational culture." Ph.D. dissertation. Washington University, St. Louis.

Herman, M. and M. Munk
1968 *Decision-Making in Poverty Programs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Herriot, R.E.
1979 *Longitudinal Study of Educational Change in Rural America*, Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Heyneman, S.
1979 "The Career Education Debate: Where the Differences Lie," *Teachers College Record*, May, Vol. 80, No. 4, pp. 659-688.

Jencks, C., *et al*.
1972 *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Jones, J., *et al*.
1979 *Work Experience and Academic Credit: Issues and Concerns*, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Kerr, C. *et al*.
1979 *Education for Employment: Knowledge for Action*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Education.

Kesselman, J.R.
1978 "Work Relief Programs in the Great Depression" in J. L. Palmer (ed.), *Creating Jobs*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Kohen, A.I. and H.S. Parnes
1970 *Career Thresholds: Volume III, A Longitudinal Study of the Educational and Labor Market Experience of Male Youth*. Columbus, Ohio: Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University, May.

Levitan, S.A., G.L. Mangum and R. Marshall
1976 *Human Resources and Labor Markets*. (Second Edition). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Liebow, E.
1967 *Tally's Corner*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Lynd, H. and R. Lynd
1928 *Middletown*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Malinowski, B.
1922 *The Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. Longon: Routledge & Kegan Pual.

Mangum, G. and J. Walsh
1973 A Decade of Manpower Development and Training. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Co.

1978 Employment and Training Programs for Youth: What Works Best for Whom? Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, Washington, D.C.

Miles, G.H.
1973 Optimizing the Benefits of Youth Projects for Rural Youth in the Southeastern United States. Prepared by North Star Research Institute for the U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Research and Development.

Miles, G.H. and W.F. Henry
1974 An Experimental Program for Ethnic Minority from the Rural Southwest. Prepared by the North Star Research Institute for the U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Research and Development, September.

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
1979 Work Experience and Academic Credit: Issues and Concerns, Ohio State University, January.

National Commission for Manpower Policy
1978 CETA: An Analysis of the Issues. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., May.

National Commission on Resources for Youth
1974 New Roles for Youth in the School and Community. New York: Citation Press.

Pelto, P.J. and G.H. Pelto
1978 Anthropological Research: The Structure of Inquiry. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pines, M. and J. Morlock
1977 CETA Program Models: Work Experience Perspectives. Office of Manpower Research and Development Monograph prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, Washington, D.C.

Polsky, N.
1967 Hustler, Beats and Others. Chicago: Aldine.

Pressman, H.
1978 "Expanding Private Sector Involvement in Youth Employment Programs: What We Need to Learn, Why We Need To Learn It", Washington, D.C.: Youthwork, Inc. (unpublished).

1978 "Job Creation Through Youth-Operated Projects: What We Need to Learn and Why We Need to Learn It." Youthwork, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Pressman, J.L. and A. Wildavsky
1973 Implementation. (Second Edition). Berekeley: University of California Press.

Rist, R.C.
1970 "Student Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education", Harvard Education Review. Vol. 40, No. 3.

1973 The Urban School: A Factory for Failure. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press.

1977 "On the Relations Among Educational Research Paradigms: From Disdain to Detante", Anthropology and Education Quarterly. Vol. 8, No. 2, May, pp. 42-50.

1978 The Invisible Children: Social Desegregation in American Society. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

1979 Desegregated Schools: Appraisals of an American Experiment. New York: Academic Press.

Rist, R.C., et al.
1979 Forging New Relationships: The CETA/School Nexus. Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.: Youthwork National Policy Study.

1979 Strategies for Coordinating Education and Employment Services: A Preliminary Analysis of Four In-School Alternatives. Occasional Paper #1, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.: Youthwork National Policy Study.

Robison, D.
1978 Training and Job Programs in Action: Case Studies in Private Sector Initiatives for the Hard to Employ. Committee for Economic Development/Work in America Institute, Inc.

Schultz, F. (ed.)
1978 Annual Editions: Readings in Education 78/79. New York: Duskin Publishing Group, Inc.

Sheff, T.
1966 Being Mentally Ill. Chicago: Aldine.

Sieber, S.D.
1973 "The Integration of Fieldwork and Survey Methods", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78, No. 6.

Smith, L. and W. Geoffrey
1968 The Complexities of the Urban Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Somers, G.G. and E.W. Stromsdofer
1972 "A Cast-Effectiveness Analysis of In-School and Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps." Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 7, Fall, pp. 446-459.

Stake, R.
1978 Case Studies in Science Education. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation. Champaign: University of Illinois.

Stevenson, W.
1978 "The Transition from School to Work" in The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment, A.V. Adams and G.L. Mangum. Kalamazoo; W. E. Upjohn Institute.

Systems Development Corporation
1973 A Topical Bibliography of Work Education Programs, Projects, and Procedures. Prepared for the U.S. Office of Education.

Taggart, Robert III.
1976 "Employment and Training Programs for Youth" in National Commission for Manpower Policy, From School to Work: Improving the Transition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor
1977a Considerations and Elements for CETA/LEA Agreements. Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Program. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1977b Exemplary In-School Youth Programs Demonstration Projects: Application Guidelines, Office of Youth Programs, Employment and Training Administration Government Printing Office.

1978 a A Knowledge Development Plan for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977. Office of Youth Programs, Employment and Training Administration. Government Printing Office.

1978 b Request on Joint DHEW/DOL Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act Workshops. Employment and Training Administration Office of Youth Programs, Washington, D.C.

1979 A Knowledge Development Plan for Youth Initiatives, Fiscal 1979. Office of Youth Programs, Employment and Training Administration. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Government
1979 Federal Register. Vol. 44, No. 65, April. Government Printing Office.

Valentine C.
1968 *Culture and Poverty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Walther, R.H.
1976 *Analysis and Synthesis of DOL Experience in Youth in Transition to Work Programs*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment, and Training Administration.

Webb, R.E., *et al*.
1966 *Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Weber, A.R.
1978 "Comments by Arnold R. Weber" in J.L. Palmer, ed. *Creating Jobs*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Weiss, C.H.
1970 "The Politization of Evaluation Research", *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 57-68.

Whyte, W.
1943 *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Work Institute of America, Inc.
1979 *Job Strategies for Urban Youth: Sixteen Pilot Programs for Action*. Scarsdale, New York.

Wurzburg, G.
1978 "Improving Job Opportunities for Youth: A Review of Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act", National Council on Employment Policy, August.

1979 *Overview to the Local Focus on Youth*. Washington, D.C.: National Council on Employment Policy, February.

Youthwork, Inc.
1978 "Youthwork Knowledge Development Plan", Washington, D.C.

1979 *Analysis Plan*. Washington, D.C. (draft)

APPENDIX

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

This analysis packet has been prepared for the Youthwork National Policy Study of the Exemplary In-School Demonstration Project, Youthwork, Inc. Any questions concerning its content or use should be directed to the study's Director, Dr. Ray C. Rist, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University.

September 1979

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Introduction

The Youthwork, Inc. programs encompass a number of strategies and program models designed to address the problems of youth unemployment and the transition of youth from school to work. Variations in the types of services offered, setting, relationships between staff and youth, and the targeting of services all represent strategies used in current programs. The organization of program components or strategies in ways that provide valuable learning experiences for the youth participants is the focus of this analysis packet.

What is the best approach to providing 14-15 year old students with an encounter in the world of work? What impact does the provision of academic credit have on the program? How do youth/staff relationships influence the program? These and many other issues are raised in this analysis packet in an effort to discern how best to organize programs to meet the needs of the youth they were designed to serve.

An understanding of the interrelationships of the program strategies, target group and other factors is a necessary precursor to clarification of issues in the broad policy area of what works best for whom and why. Exploration and explication of issues surrounding the areas of youth as consumers, the social organization and the provision of services represents a starting point from which we can address this policy area.

I. Youth As Consumers

The interplay of youth characteristics with program components or strategeis may provide insight into the question of what works for whom.

Participant descriptors such as age and economic status need to be invesitgated to determine their role as predictors of program success/failure. This analysis may foster the designing of programs containing components more appropriate to the needs of the youth served (targeing of services).

A. Youth Characteristics

Data which describes the youth participants will help provide a basis from which we can distinguish the success of variou program approaches and components in relation to the needs of different youth populations.

1) What are the participant demographic characteristics (e.g. age, sex, economic status, race, educational status)?

2) Are there any unique groups being served (e.g. offenders, dropouts, teenage parents)?

B. Program Access and Entree

The initial linkage of youth and their programs is invesitgated through the following questions. The focus is also on the identification of the types of students (e.g. in-school, offenders)) program attract.

1) How did the youth learn of their program?

2) What was it about the program which convinced youth to join?

3) Describe the types of students that are attracted by your program.

4) What made it possible for youth such as dropouts, handicapped youth, ttenage parents, and other social groups to participate? How were these special groups identified and recruited?

5) Ask key program personnel (e.g. program director or coordinator) what had been the original plan for the identification and acquisition of youth participants. That is, how did they plan to identify eligible enrollees? How did they play to encourage identified youth to enter the program?

6) For programs entering their second school year, ask key program personnel if their approaches to the identification and acquisition of youth participants has changed. If yes, how and why? Have these changes proven more successful than prior approaches to identifying and acquiring youth participants? In what ways?

C. Appropriateness of Program Service Targeting

The targeting of appropriate services to specific types of youth can be crucial to the success of a program. That which works well for 14-15 year old youth may be inappropriate for older youth. Accordingly, that which works well for dropouts may fail when applied to in-school youth. The identification of program components and their use with various youth groups is the focus of the following questions.

1) Which group(s) did your project specifically propose to serve (e.g. dropouts, handicapped)? What were determined to be the needs (e.g. educational, other) of these youth?

2) Has the program been successful in reaching the desired population? If yes, how?

3) What services were given to specifically help this group (e.g. day care for teenage parents)?

4) Which program components have had the greatest influence on the targeted group? In what ways?

5) Ask key program personnel from both the program (ccordinators, teachers, etc.) and the operating agencies (CETA, LEA, etc.) their opinion as to what is the best approach to providing a bridge between the youth being served and the world of work. That is, what appears to work best for dropouts or 14-15 year olds (or whatever the specific groups being served by the program)?

6) Ask students which aspects of the program have the most meaning for them. What do you like about the program? Any specific components--classroom career exploration, remedial help, etc.? Be sure to note the descriptive characteristics of the youth with whom you speak (e.g. age, sex, special group status).

D. Program Ability to Retain Youth

Numerous factors can enter into a youth's decision to remain in or leave a program. The personal attention by staff and the availability of a job are but two examples of factors which may influence a youth's decision about program participation. The following questions focus on program retention of youth participants.

1) Describe the characteristics (age, sex, etc.) of youth who stay in the program and of those who leave.

2) What reasons do youth give for leaving the program? for staying?

3) Does the program have a group of students who have returned for a second year? If yes, why have they decided to continue in the program?

4) What do youth perceive to be the advantages of remaining in the program?

5) Ask program personnel why they feel youth leave or remain in the program. Do the staff or program components influence youth decisions?

II. The Social Organization

The social organization of a program may be an influential determinant in the program experience of youth participants. The relationships which develop between the youth and staff may be related to whether or not and to what extent a youth is able to take advantage of the services offered by a program. Additionally, the relationship between these programs and other programs, the administrative procedures of the program and even the ability of youth to participate in the decision-making process of the program all may be seen as pieces comprising the social organization of the program.

A. Staff/Student Relations

Contact between youth and program personnel is a continual daily occurence. Interaction between these two groups on both a formal and an informal basis needs to be investigated.

1) What are the relationships between staff and youth? Are they strictly formal as in a structured classroom setting or more informal as in a group discussion?

2) Do youth have access to program staff whenever it is desired or is there a formal process which needs to be followed? Who initiates these interactions?

3) Identify the types and roles of program staff. How did each of these individuals learn of the position? When hired were they already in the system operating the program (e.g. already a teacher in the school where the program is being operated) or were they located outside of the operating system?

4) Do the staff and youth involve in recreational activities together (e.g. lunch time activities)?

5) Does there exist contact between the staff and youth at times other than during the program hours? In other settings? For what purposes?

6) Ask students and staff which forms of instructions strengthen their relationships within the program?

B. Relationships Between Staff and Other Program Staff

In most settings there exists any number of on-going programs for youth. This area will explore the means by which the current programs have or have not been linked with other youth programs.

1) Does (or has) there exist(ed) any contact with program personnel from other programs? Who has initiated these contacts?

2) What has been the purpose of such contact?

3) Are these relations cordial and friendly or cold and distant? Why?

4) Has there been any exchanges of ideas concerning operation of a youth program? Any discussions of various program components or strategies? What are other purposes for these meetings?

5) Were the contacts intiated as a means of introducing this program and its purposes to others?

6) How often does the contact occur?

7) How to staff relations between programs affect the programs operation?

8) What suggestions have been made to improve inter-program staff relations?

C. Characterization of Program Administration

Administrative issues, those closely associated with program management, are often delegated to program administrators. The delegation of power within the program is the focus of the following questions.

1) Describe the decsion making structure of the program (e.g. director, counselors, teacher, advisory boards, etc.).

2) How would you characterize the program administration (e.g. a formal bureaucracy and hierarchial, participatory, decentralized, other)?

3) Would you describe the program administration as a one-man operation or does it take the joint efforts of many to facilitate (or hinder) the program?

4) What are the administrative responsibilities and to whom are they delegated?

5) What has been or can be done to improve the program's administration?

D. Student Interaction

Just as the social organization is influenced by the interaction of youth and staff, so too is it influenced by the interaction of the youth among themselves.

1) Does there exist a place where program youth can congregate?
2) What forms of youth interaction occur (e.g. recreational, tutoring)?
3) In what ways do these interactions influence program functioning?

E. Structures for Youth Involvement in Program Operation

Youth input into the program's operation represents one means of allowing the youth to impact upon the social organization. Another form of impact may be seen through the freedom of choices allowed youth.

1) What kinds of structures exist for youth input into the operation of the program (e.g. youth councils, suggestion box)? Do they carry any weight, i.e. have an impact?
2) Are the youth encouraged to participate in the program's operation?
3) Does there exist institutionalized options: whereby the youth can choose to take only certain program options or have the option to choose among concurrent options; whereby the youth can initiate changes to meet their needs?
4) How much autonomy do students have in their decision about participating in various program components?
5) Is independent decision-making on the part of youth encouraged by the program? How? By staff? How?

F. Role of CETA and/or the School in the Social Organization of The Program

Sponsoring agencies, be they CETA, LEA, or CBO, impact upon the organization and operation of a program in some way. For this analysis the emphasis will be on their relations with the program's students and staff.

1) How do these organizations impact on student/staff/ program relations?
2) Do their representatives become involved with the youth? How? Why?
3) Do their representatives become involved with program operation? How? Why?

III. Provision of Services

In examining what works best for whom, one essential aspect to consider is that of the services being offered. The current programs combine various incentives, such as academic credit and income, with a variety of approaches to the problem of youth transition from school to work. These approaches or strategies combine to form the curriculum used by the program.

As have been alluded to earlier various program component may work better with or specific youth groups than with others. The focus of this area, then, is to look more closely at the various services provided by the current program in relation to the youth served.

A. Academic Credit

One aspect of many programs is the provision of academic credit for program participation. The following questions investigate the variety of ways in which academic credit is offered.

1) Is academic credit awarded? If no, why not?

2) Is academic credit awarded as elective credit or as basic skills credit? If the later, in which subjects is it granted?

3) Can one receive credit in lieu of taking a traditional course? (For example, can one receive credit for English by working at an employment site--credit for what one knows or has learned.)

4) How is the equivalency of an alternative approach to a subject (say English) determined to be equivalent to that which one learns in a traditional class?

5) Are there established competency levels at which academic credit will be awarded?

6) How much academic credit can a youth receive [illegible] program participation. How many credits do the youth need to graduate?

7) For what program components do youth receive academic credit? (Only classroom phase; only work phase; both?)

8) Who certifies that the youth have met the necessary criteria for the awarding of credit?

9) Who was involved in establishing the criteria for the awarding of credit? What are these criteria?

B. Program Activities for which Income is Received

One purpose of the current program is to provide low income youth with an income. Each program has devised a means by which this process occurs. The line of questioning here focus on these various approaches and their implications for future programs.

1) Do youth receive income for attending class? What types of classes (e.g. for career exploration but not remedial help)?

2) What stipulations are placed on the receipt of this income (e.g. have to attend class)?

3) Do youth receive income for participating in the work experience phase?

4) Do youth receive a stipend for transportation costs?

5) Do the youth receive differing rates of income dependent upon the phase of the program in which they are involved (e.g. $2.90 for classroom; $4.00 for work experience)? What are the pay scales used by the program?

6) How important to the youth is this income? Would they participate in the program without this incentive? Why?

7) What has been the feedback from individuals outside the program (e.g. school staff, students outside the program, the community) in regard to the issue of "paying youth to go to school"? How has this been resolved?

C. Program Curriculum

A wide variety of edcuational strategies have been combined in the designing of the curriculum for the current programs. A clearer understanding of these curricula and how they are being utilized is the focus of the following questions.

1) What are the components of the program? What activities are continual in each program component (e.g. classroom phase may contain values clarification, career exploration

and employment skills, etc)? Be fairly specific as to what is encompassed in each phase.

2) What occurs during a typical day in one of these program components? Here your program observations should clearly reflect what is happening.

3) How much time is devoted to each program component or activity? DO program staff and youth feel enough time is spent in these various components?

4) Does there exist a work experience component? If yes, what form does it take (e.g. in a closed program shop, vocational exploration, OJT)? How much time is spent in this phase of the program?

5) Who helped design the program's curriculum (e.g. staff only, businessmen involved, others)?

6) How has the program been melded with the students regular schooling? (For example, do youth attend regular school mornings and the program afternoons?) What problems have arisen in this melding process and how have they been resolved?

7) Does there exist a document specifying the program curriculum's components, objectives and goals? Is it refered to and used in measuring the program's progress?

8) What options exist for youth input into the program/s curriculum? (See Section II).

9) Does there exist a process by which various curriculum components can be revised/deleted? Has this happened? Why?